**Narration for Information, Illustration, and Evocation**

A PLAN B PROJECT
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Jonathan Richard Gill

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

May 2010

Accepted as a Plan B project:

Project Supervisor Date

# Narration for Information, Illustration, and Evocation

Linguistic analysis of oral narrative has consisted of the analysis of its features (Labov, 1972; Polanyi, 1985), devices (Szatrowski, in press), and functions (Takahashi, in press). Pedagogical theory has attempted to harness narrative as a purposeful tool in the classroom (Daniel, 2007; Ganske, 2007). This paper combines these practices, by analyzing narrative inside and outside the classroom. By analyzing two narratives from a university research presentation, and four narratives from casual conversation between peers, I outline three basic purposes for narrative: Information (transfer of facts), Illustration (providing evidence), and Evocation (causing or calling upon a shared emotion). This range of purposes, evidenced by the narratives' common features, is found in both casual conversation and research presentation discourses. Although these contexts reflect separate genres of discourse (Swales, 1990; 2004), my findings suggest that narrative serves a common purpose inside and outside the classroom.

## Introduction[1]

"Good stories are ones that have some meaning for their audience" (Hatch, 1992, p. 166). Therefore, I find the purpose behind a narrative to be quite important. This paper outlines three purposes for narratives: Information (transfer of facts), Illustration (providing evidence), and Evocation (causing or calling upon a shared emotion). By comparing and contrasting two narratives from formal classroom presentations and four narratives from less formal face-to-face conversations, I give criteria for examining the purposes of a narrative. In order to do this, I examine storytelling devices in the manner of Szatrowski (in press), by analyzing topical coherence, knowledge questions, groundwork, and evaluation (in comparators, gesture, and repetition) in and around the narratives. I conclude that any narrative could be sorted into one (or more) of these three categories. This analysis builds on Labov's work on the importance of evaluation by showing how it can give more specific insight into "why [the narrative] was told, and what the narrator is getting at" (1972, p. 366). It also contributes to pedagogical research, by suggesting that by showing the common purposes for narrative, we can use it to become (and train our students to become) efficient teachers, persuasive instructors, and involving storytellers.

## Previous Research

This analysis is situated between the linguistic notions of narrative structure (e.g., Labov, 1972; Norrick, 2005; Sacks, 1992), the involvement and collaboration present in narrative (Schiff & Noy, 2006; Tannen, 1987), and some of the approaches regarding the pedagogical role of narrative in the classroom (Daniel, 2007; Ganske, 2005; Hatch, 1992;

Holmes & Marra, 2005). Like Norrick (2000) and Takahashi (in press), this paper focuses on the purposes of narrative, as evidenced by the functions of its observable devices. In this section, I will first outline working definitions for narrative and its features, and then discuss the relevant approaches for narrative in the classroom. Similarly to Takahashi (in press), I connect the linguistic features and pedagogical uses for narrative, by showing that analysis of the functions of a narrative serve to define its role in the classroom.

### *Working Definitions, Models, and Features of Narrative*

For a working definition of narrative,[2] Labov says it is "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred" (1972, p. 359). However, I agree with Takahashi (in press) and Norrick (2000; 2005) in seeing the need to expand this definition to include not only the actual experience of the teller, but also "the recounting of things [the teller] has heard or read, or his/her fantasies or dreams and so on" (Takahashi, in press, pp. 1-2). I include in my definition sequences of imaginary or hypothetical events, because many narratives rely not just on a recounting of past experience and events, but on the "tellability" of the narrative (Karatsu, 2004; Sacks, 1992; Tannen, 1987), and the way in which the teller remembers and recapitulates it. For example, Schiff and Noy (2006) analyze the stories of a Holocaust survivor, and find the use of a great deal of images that require shared meaning for the listener to interpret – whether or not the image was an actual character or not. Their informant used a character she called "Demjanjuk," who was neither the actual historical figure, nor in fact one

single person, but an embodiment of a set of characters performing a set of events at a time in her past. While the events were real, not every piece of the event sequence and agents thereof were necessarily included to be concrete, as Labovians might hope; instead, the shared meanings that the teller includes serve to give more personal connection to her audience, as well as more personal authority to her narrative.

The telling of a story is done in a way that is familiar and expected, emphasizing how ordinary the teller was (and how ordinary what the teller was doing was) when experiencing the events (Sacks, 1984). Essentially, it is everyone's "business in life…only to see and report the usual aspects of any possibly usual scene" (Sacks, 1992, vol. 2, pp. 215-217). Balancing this idea of "doing 'being ordinary'" is the notion of "tellability", which emphasizes how "remarkable" the events (and background information) of the story are made out to be (pp. 233-235). Labov (1972) echoes this: "if the event becomes common enough, it is no longer a violation of an expected rule of behavior, and it is not reportable" (pp. 370-371). Karatsu (2004) summarizes these researchers and several others, saying that "researchers have suggested that the tellability of past events rests on their being unusual/out-of-the-ordinary in contrast with the ordinary in daily life and social/cultural norms" (p. 59). All listeners are assumed to already know what it means to "be ordinary" (qualifying the teller), and what events are extraordinary or "remarkable" (qualifying the events as worthy of being told). Therefore, tellability depends largely on the uses of shared meaning and assumptions, since although the events set the story apart as "not ordinary", the use of shared meanings (in the story's characters, evaluations, descriptions, and background information) helps the story "be ordinary" in its connection to the audience.

Szatrowski (in press) compiles a number of storytelling devices, later comparing their use across three genres: casual conversation, lecture storytelling, and narrative retellings of animations. Table 1 is her useful summary of storytelling devices.

Table 1: Storytelling Devices (Szatrowski, in press, p.5):

1. Topical Coherence
2. Knowledge Questions
3. Groundwork, Confirm Circumstances
4. Evaluation
    a. Gesture
    b. Comparators
    c. Repetition (for Evaluation, Clarification)
    d. Co-construction
    e. Onomatopoeia
    f. Casual utterances (direct style, fillers, laughter, contracted forms)

After compiling and sorting these devices for storytelling, Szatrowski analyzes their use across the three genres, showing how they serve to create involvement with their audiences. I will analyze many of these devices (in two genres) in the varying situations of these data, and show how they serve to inform, illustrate, and/or evoke an emotion in the audience. I do not have the space in this paper to thoroughly analyze all present examples of every device on this list, so I focus more on some (e.g., a great deal of repetition is found in the data), and not at all on others (no examples of onomatopoeia are found in the data).

Szatrowski defines the main devices and discusses how they may be used in the three genres in her data. *Topical Coherence* "refers to the need to fit...into the prior topic sequence in order to make it tellable...in the topic sequence" (p. 6). *Knowledge Questions* help the teller find a suitable place to put the story. She says,

> The storytellings in all three genre can start with knowledge questions, that is, questions that confirm potential story recipients' knowledge of information related to the story. For example, an animation narrative can begin with a question that confirms knowledge of a story character such as *Pinguu tte sitte ru*? 'Do you know Pingu (the penguin character in the animation)?' (p. 6)

She draws upon Sacks's observations of "request formats," which a teller uses to ask for information which he needs to tell the story (p. 229). The teller uses *Groundwork* (also called Confirm Circumstances) to establish the tellability of his story within the participants' knowledge of the world (Karatsu, 2004, p. 57). Groundwork involves the connection of the teller's story and the listener's previous knowledge of the story and the world, and the results of these circumstances will determine its tellability. For example, both Karatsu and Szatrowski found evidence of tag questions such as *yo ne* 'you know' to be a good example of Groundwork/Confirm Circumstances device in Japanese. Finally, the largest category of devices is *Evaluation*, and this is drawn from dozens of past studies and analyses (Labov, 1972; Norrick, 2005; Polanyi, 1985; Tannen, 1987; and others). Evaluation can take many forms, as Table 1 illustrates; I look specifically at Comparators (big/small, old/new, more/less, etc.), Repetition, and Gesture. Polanyi notes that "any device available for evaluation can be used nonevaluatively as well" (1985, p. 14). However, as Labov emphasizes, Evaluation is the key to find a story's "*raison d'être*": "why it was told, and what the narrator is getting at" (1972, p. 366).

Before moving on to pedagogical aspects of narrative, the last thing to note about the linguistic aspects of the narratives in these data is the genre. While this term is used in a wide variety of definitions, I follow Swales (1990) in a (simplified) conglomerated working definition, that genre:

> (1) is a class of communicative events, and
> (2) these contain a shared set of communicative purposes, such that
> (3) the rationale for a genre establishes constraints on allowable contributions.
> (adapted from Swales, pp. 45-58)

Using this definition, I approach "lecture" as a genre separate from "casual conversation." Although both genres are broad, they differ enough in their discourse to

warrant distinguishing up front. Swales discusses research presentations[3] as a genre (pp. 182-186), drawing from Dubois's extensive work on biomedical research presentations in the 1980s. He notes that lectures are unique even from other forms of research reporting (such as written articles, poster presentations, abstracts, grant proposals, etc.), and that they utilize narration as their main mode of discourse (p. 186). While individual lectures will vary greatly, "lecture" fits the criteria to be called a genre.

Likewise, it is evident in my data that "lecture" also varies from "casual conversation," in (at least) its discourse, turn-taking, and interactive expectations. Questions and the uses of "you" are more general and rhetorical, the turns of the lecturer(s) are generally quite long, and whole lectures can pass without a word from the audience. While this paper is not genre analysis at its heart, it is important to note the different systems governing the production of any given narrative, in order to appropriately analyze the narratives produced in casual conversation, and those produced in a research presentation.

### *Narrative in the Classroom*

While entire subfields of pedagogical approaches seek to discuss and define the role of a teacher in the classroom, this is not the aim of this paper. Instead, I seek only to devise a distinguishable role for narrative in the classroom, as this in turn can contribute to the overall role of a teacher (whether or not he or she is the narrator). I review several studies specifically about the use of storytelling for teaching (Daniel, 2007; Ganske, 2007), followed by analyses specifically on storytelling/narrative found in the classroom (Szatrowski, in press; Takahashi, in press). Finally, I justify the analysis of narrative

discourse for the purposes of the language-learning classroom (Hatch, 1992; Swales, 1990).

*The Use of Storytelling for Teaching*

In a study of 76 teachers surveying their views of storytelling, Ganske (2007) addresses six underlying assumptions about storytelling in the classroom:

> (1) Most everyone enjoys a good story.
> (2) Speech is the most complete and authentic medium available to communicators.
> (3) Constructivism [teacher as "facilitator of interactive learning," rather than "direct teaching"] is only one theory explaining how knowledge is created.
> (4) Story is the primary communication technique between friends.
> (5) Knowledge, to be complete, requires an affective component.
> (6) Over fifty years of research and study of technology provides unequivocal evidence that the personal contribution of the teacher is paramount to the success of the technology.
> (summarized from Ganske, 2007, pp. 336-337)

In his study, the teachers were all enrolled in a "teacher education through technology" course at a university. They were surveyed before and after the course, to see how their judgments regarding the use of storytelling had varied after several months of various technology-based assignments that used storytelling components. Ganske found not only great evidence to support these six assumptions, but also a much higher opinion overall of the usefulness of storytelling in the classroom. His specifies his broad definition of *communication technology* as something that "uses tools to extend the clarity and fidelity of shared ideas and experiences" (Ganske, 2007, p. 335). He concludes:

> Stories as described here are a form of technology in the sense that they extend the capabilities of the teacher in creating and sharing a learning experience. They are an older form of technology but they are as vital today as they were when they were first introduced to communication. (p. 344)

While Ganske sees storytelling as a "technology" for teaching, Daniel (2007) sees good teaching as a form of narrative. He proposes "a means of constructing stories as the base on which to build coherent and comprehensible educational experiences" (p. 735). To show this, he applies Greimas and Cortes's (1982) Actantial Narrative Schema to areas of teaching that seem less likely to contain narrative (such as teaching mathematics), as well as the more common applications, such as history (cf. Hamer, 2000). According to Daniel, the five fundamental aspects of classroom storytelling are:

> • The use of the unmediated text.
> • The employment of narrative storytelling[4] and narrative teaching.
> • The informed selection of suitable material.
> • The place of the teacher as principle storyteller in the classroom.
> • Absence and completion – engagement and story.
> (p. 736)

Daniel adopts the character functions of a narrative developed by Greimas & Cortes (1982), and applies these functions (*subject*, *object*, *sender*, *receiver*, *helper*, & *opponent*) to various subjects, including Little Red Riding Hood, the Norman conquest of Britain, and multiplying 14 by 3. He outlines how to divide each player in these topics to one of the six functions, and shows how from there, a teacher could, for any topic, construct a lesson that followed a narrative pattern, lending itself to be more easily understood. In selecting a narrative, Daniel suggests seven criteria for stories suitable for classroom use:

> • personal resonance;
> • a coherent narrative;
> • lingustic comprehensibility;
> • appropriateness to the developmental level of the students;
> • cultural relevance;
> • a curriculum link;
> • a socially constructive message.
> (p. 744)

Essentially, both Ganske and Daniel support the extensive and fundamental use of storytelling in the classroom, though they give very different reasons for reaching that conclusion. Other studies also support the role of teacher as storyteller (Hamer, 2000), and the value of the narrative as a fundamental element of human learning (Noe, 2002; Schram, 1994).

All of these studies outline the need for a general sense of narrative in the classroom, but few have looked at the narrative that actually appears in the classroom. Linguistic analysis of narrative in lecture can provide the needed perspective in this regard.

*Narrative Structure and Function in Lecture*

Both Szatrowski (in press) and Takahashi (in press), in their analyses of university lecture data, note that lecture discourse differs from standard discourse for a variety of reasons, the most salient difference being the dearth of verbal contributions from the student audience. In the (large[5]) lecture genre, the floor (the right to speak; Yule, 1996, p. 72) tends to be kept far more often than it is yielded, and contributions from the audience generally amount to little more than nods, eye contact (or lack of it), occasional laughter, and backchannel utterances (*mmhmm*, etc., which serve to show the speaker that the message is being received; Yule, p. 75). In her study of a Japanese lecture, Szatrowski analyses how the professor tells the story of a *haiku*. She finds that the devices the professor used to involve her students were very similar to those used in casual conversation, noting specifically the uses of internal evaluations such as comparators, gestures (pictorial, deictic, and beat), onomatopoeia, and repetition.

Szatrowski shows how in spite of the lack of verbal participation, the professor can still create involvement through the storytelling devices outlined previously (Table 1, p. 4).

In a study of sixty narratives found in four Japanese university lectures, Takahashi (in press) demonstrates four functions and three sub-functions of narratives in lecture discourse. By looking at how narratives are introduced, and how they are unified with preceding and subsequent context, Takahashi shows that narrative in lecture discourse functions to:

> Table 2: Takahashi's categories of lecture narrative functions
> (summarized from Takahashi, in press)
> 1. **Illustrate:** narratives preceded by an assessment, and provide an explanation for or an example related to that assessment.
> 2. **Elaborate:** narratives that provide important details that create the very content of the lecture. Divided into three types:
>  a. ***Give Details:*** narratives that give details related to the topic introduced in the previous discourse.
>  b. ***Review/Preview:*** presents a previous, present, or forthcoming lecture in narrative form rather than discussing the topic of the lecture (i.e., the topic is about the lecture itself).
>  c. ***Epitomize:*** narratives that support an abstract idea or a general comment by telling typical stories related to the ideal/comment.
> 3. **Present a Topic/Problem:** narrative in which the professor introduces a topic or provides a problem to be interpreted in the subsequent lecture.
> 4. **Build Rapport:** narratives in which the professor relates his or her past experiences [in order to] help bring together the professor, students, and lecture.

Since these findings are similar to my own, I will refer to his study further in the discussion. Similarly to Takahashi, I too look at the functions of narrative in lecture discourse, but I also compare data from casual conversation, in order to arrive at a broader set of functions for all narrative, comparable to Takahashi's functions for narrative in lecture.

*Applying Narrative Analysis*

Of the studies on narrative, classroom discourse, and narrative for teaching, few (if any) studies have compared narrative in the classroom to narrative outside the

classroom. Both Swales (1990) and Hatch (1992) outline in their introductions, as one of the purposes for their books on genre and discourse analysis (respectively), the need to understand the systems of English in academic settings. The ability to analyze real data "for applied ends" (Swales, 1990, p. 1) keeps the language teacher accountable to real language, making teaching language more authentic and applicable for teacher and student.

The goal of this analysis, then, is to encourage language teachers, through a linguistic analysis of the common features of narratives, to apply these purposes of narrative in the classroom, in order to enhance language learning and the teacher-student connection. Essentially, this analysis seeks to answer two questions:

1. What common features can be found in lecture and conversational narratives?
2. How can teachers make use of narrative categories?

## Method

### *Data Sets and Participants*

Six narratives were selected from three sets of data, two narratives from each set. The participants in these narratives were identical for the second and third sets, and each set involved two speakers, one of whom was given the floor for the entirety, or at least majority of the narrative. The data sets, narratives, their participants, and the appendices in which they can be found are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Narratives and Participants

| **Data Set (video recording)** | **Participants** | **Narratives selected (Primary narrator)** | **Topic of narratives** | **Appendix** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| University research presentation | A: Professor; T: Undergraduate student of A | "How I got involved in research evaluating a website" (T) | T describes how he got involved in the project on which A and T are presenting | A |
| | | "Clip art" (A) | A's publisher trying to use clip art instead of photos | C |
| Casual conversation (first meeting) | W: Undergraduate student, researcher of G; G: Graduate student, research subject | "How Uzbekistan became the strictest country in Central Asia" (G) | The recent history of Central Asian governments | B |
| | | "*Mexmon*-ing" (G) | An odd cultural custom of Central Asia | D |
| Casual conversation (third meeting) | W and G | "Restoration of Iraq" (G) | G's involvement during the war in Iraq | E |
| | | "Delusions of grandeur" (G) | Comparison of recent and ancient dictators | F |

In this section, I briefly outline the background of the participants, and the contexts in which the narratives occurred. Full transcriptions of the six narratives are given in Appendices A-F. A key to reading the transcription is located in Appendix G. The handout to accompany the research presentation is given in Appendix H.

*Research Presentation (participants A and T)*

The first data set comes from an academic presentation on a research project, given to an undergraduate class on language and culture. Two narratives are taken from this presentation, one by a professor (entitled "clip art") and one by a student presenter (entitled "How I got involved in research evaluating a website"). Professor Aaron Cavitz[6] (A, or "Professor A") is a tenured professor at a major U.S. university, and the primary investigator for a research project on the use of a website he helped develop. Toby Johnson (T) is an undergraduate student at the same university, and a co-investigator who has been collecting data for Professor A's project. They co-present on their findings. Professor A is 65 years old, has been a professor for over thirty-five years, has written dozens of books and has hundreds of publications, most of them centering on language acquisition and language teaching. He has lived and worked abroad for many

years at a time, including positions in Bolivia, Israel, Brazil, and New Zealand. Toby is 20 years old, and has traveled abroad on a few occasions, the longest being several months in Tunisia and Morocco. Both A and T are native speakers of American English, though T is from a Midwest dialect, and A comes from an East Coast dialect. The project they present on is an investigation of the effectiveness of a website that teaches strategies for language learning. G (described below) was an off-camera observer (as a teaching assistant) during the presentation given by A and T.

*Informal Conversations (G and W)*

The second and third data sets were used with permission from videotaped conversations between two students of sociolinguistics. In the contexts of both videos, William Burress (W) is recording the conversation between himself and Gilbert Jones (G), in order to analyze the conversation for evidence of style shifting, which he will be comparing with similar data from Japanese conversation. W is 21 years old, and an undergraduate student studying business and entrepreneurship at a major U.S. university. He has some background studying Japanese, and has never studied abroad, though he hopes to visit Japan. G is 29 years old, and a graduate student studying English as a second language at the same university. He has traveled extensively, visiting twenty countries on trips that lasted one month or less. He spent six years in the U.S. Marines, and spent a year and a half in Iraq and Kuwait. Both W and G are native speakers of English, from an upper Midwestern metropolitan area.

W and G's conversations vary widely in topic, but the most common theme of the first data set – in which W and G are just meeting each other – is G's plans to move to Central Asia to teach English as a foreign language. More than half of the second data

set – the third meeting between W and G – involves a recounting of G's experiences in Iraq.

### *Data Collection and Analysis Procedures*

All of the data were collected by video recording. The lecture recordings were collected by the researcher, and the conversation recordings were collected by W and used with permission. All existing data were used with IRB approval, under study #0912E75557. Each video recording is approximately thirty minutes in length, and two narrative portions have been excerpted from each video recording, resulting in the six narratives analyzed. Video recordings were transcribed by the researcher, including transcriptions of the data recorded by W.

Transcription notation can be seen in Appendix G. Data were analyzed using a Discourse Analytic approach; therefore, no intentions, emotions, or meaning can be aid to the analysis except that which is actively apparent in the actual text. Analysis of the possible corresponding meanings of non-verbal actions were at the judgment of the researcher; the actions are transcribed as specifically and objectively as possible. Information about the participants' background is for the purpose of context.

## Findings and Discussion

The analysis of the data has been arranged into three categories of purpose (Information, Illustration, Evocation), highlighting some of the common features between each type of narrative. After analyzing each set of stories for the relevant devices, I give

a summary of the necessary and helpful features in categorizing a narrative of each type, as well as a few that could disqualify each.

### *Informational Narrative*

In this section, I identify several important features of informational narrative. The most important is related to Labov's (1972) "recapitulation of experience" and the "matching of a verbal sequence" in its most basic sense. That is, the narrator is passing on information about a sequence of events that transpired, to which the listener was not privy before the story was told (i.e., had not experienced the events nor heard the story before). If this is a requirement for the informative function, it should be expected to find features that support these facts about the participants. A basic device for establishing tellability is Szatrowski's (in press) idea of "Knowledge Questions", which are "questions used to establish the proper level of knowledge among potential recipients" (p. 6). The term "Knowledge Question" is narrowly labeled, but could be used before any narrative. For an Informational narrative, I suggest using the term "Knowledge Gap". The potential teller may not always use questions to establish the story's place, but could use situations, statements, offers, or even statements or questions made by the potential recipients. All of these could be explicit or implicit.[7] Evidence of a Knowledge Gap could even take the form of a spoken, idiomatic acronym such as *FYI* ('for your information'), which is a short way of offering information to someone the speaker believes to have need of it. To find where and how potential tellers establish the knowledge gap of the potential recipients, I suggest looking for evidence of either (1) speaker (potential storyteller) testing or asking about the knowledge of potential

recipients (explicitly through a Knowledge Question or Groundwork, or implicitly through statements, offers, story prefaces, or situations), or (2) potential recipients requesting information in an explicit question (*can you tell me about...*) or revealing a Knowledge Gap with an implicit statement (*I don't know anything about...*).

*Information in Lecture Narrative: "How I Got Involved in Research Evaluating a Website"*

In this narrative, found in Transcript 1, Professor A has finished describing the facets of the website A and T investigated, and introduces student T to the class. There is Topical Cohesion between this section and the beginning of the presentation, partly evidenced in the fact that the entire structure of topic for this presentation was printed onto a power point handout (see Appendix H). As Szatrowski (in press) mentioned, the topical cohesion of the lecture tends to be set – not only are the topics in print (on the presentation handout) and the order pre-set, but this lack of negotiability can be found in the introduction of T by A in lines 1-2: *what...Toby is going to describe to you*. The narrative that follows is T's way of establishing tellability, even though he has already been given the floor to do so. The Knowledge Gap here is not in a question, but rather in the situation. The story of his personal involvement helps to establish a reason for him to be presenting in front of his classmates alongside the professor, instead of the professor doing it himself as usual. Although no one has overtly asked, "Why is Toby presenting today," nor, "How did Toby get involved in this project," the unusual situation prompts Toby to answer these unspoken questions in a narrative.

**(Transcript 1)[8] L5900f09STORY10m9m1, 14:13-15:57,**
**"How I got involved in research evaluating a website"**
A = Professor presenting on research
B = Undergraduate student co-presenting

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Having explained the features and purposes of the website, Professor A introduces undergraduate student T, who then explains how he got involved in the research project and what his role was.* | | |
| 1 | A: | so what we were doing= |
| 2 | | n' Toby is going to describe to you |
| 3 | | (.) was an effort to move in and |
| 4 | | find out what users actually *DO:* |
| 5 | | at th=website (.) n'w=tha=we *have* it |
| 6 | | (0.4) wha=do they do with it |
| 7 | | (.) and wha-hh. what benefits might |
| 8 | | (accrue=from that) (.) |
| | | ((turns and motions to Toby)) |
| 9 | | so you're on. |
| | | // ((steps back)) \|\| |
| 10 | T: | //sure |
| | | ((stands up)) \|\| |
| | | ((back facing class)) |
| 11 | | So: |
| | | ((turns)) |
| 12 | | (0.2) um: |
| 13 | | (.) I'm Toby, by the way |
| 14 | | (.) if=you=can't |
| 15 | | (if=you don't know me by now) |
| 16 | | uh but=uh I- uh: got involved |
| 17 | | with this project my freshman year |
| 18 | | after uh |
| 19 | | (0.2) being in uh |
| 20 | | (.) Professor Cavitz's |
| 21 | | uh seminar, a:nd=um: |
| 22 | | (0.3) uh=basically: |
| 23 | | (1.1) after=discussing with him for a while |
| 24 | | uhhm throughout the semester::=we:: |
| 25 | | found that this project=was=going=on |
| 26 | | and like he said he wanted somebody |
| 27 | | (0.3) u:m to come in an=and=evaluate this website |
| 28 | | (.) and so that's where I came along |
| 29 | | (.) and uh (.) also my co-researcher, Lars White? |
| 30 | | (0.3) um |
| 31 | | (0.5) we both applied for University grants |
| 32 | | (.) to uh |
| 33 | | (.) basically:: |
| | | ((gestures with paper)) |
| 34 | | (0.5) evaluate the website, see: |
| 35 | | (0.3) how effective it is for students, |
| 36 | | a::nd how=th-=how=they're using it=n |
| 37 | | (.) what their thoughts=n: recommendations=n: |
| 38 | | feelings=n: what- basically=what |
| 39 | | are they gain(ing) from it. |
| 40 | | (0.5) A:nd so, |
| 41 | | (0.8) um (.) our purpose like=I=said was to |
| 42 | | evaluate the=ffectiv'ss of the website. |
| 43 | | (.) And we got our grant in=the=uh: |
| 44 | | (0.3) we applied for it in the fall of |
| 45 | | 2007 and uh it was for spring=of 2008 |
| 46 | | and then=uh because of some |
| 47 | | (0.4) website delays (.) of |
| 48 | | (.) creating the website (.) |
| 49 | | and also we wanted to (.) test its uh: |
| 50 | | (0.3) how people thought of its graphics and stuff, |
| 51 | | um: we did some testing over the summers |
| 52 | | and prli-=preliminary (testing?) |
| 53 | | so we REally didn't actually get to doing |
| 54 | | research on the actual um effectiveness |
| 55 | | of the website until uh February |
| 56 | | o:f last year=February=2009 |
| 57 | | er, this year u:m. |
| 58 | | (0.4) so (0.7) |

There are a few things to notice in this narrative. First, the information is "offered" at the beginning (1-2) in a sort of *abstract* ("one or two clauses summarizing the whole story", Labov, 1972, p. 363), though this abstract is not by the narrator that actually relates the sequence of events. Rather, since the speakers are working off a pre-arranged topic sequence (the handout makes this overt), this is carried out by A, who still has the floor from his part of the presentation. Professor A yields the floor in line 9 by saying, "so you're on" and stepping away from the main presentation area. These two features (non-narrator information offer, and explicit floor-yielding) differ somewhat from the flow and form of narrative in natural conversation, in which it is generally the storyteller offering the information or recipient requesting it, and the narration floor of co-tellers is negotiated implicitly.

In the narrative itself (16-57), T goes through a sequence of events (some of which have been pre-arranged by the handout), but has to place the timing of these events within a context, for *orientation* (identification of "time, place, persons, and their activity or situation," Labov, 1972, p. 364). T gives indications of the chronology of events in 18-21, 23-24, 28, 44-45, and 53-57. The placement of the main events is intermingled with other background events and chronological information scattered between them. The events are as follows, in chronological order (not narrative order):

*Events (main and background):*

1. Professor A is involved in a research project (line 25, showing it was already in progress before T became involved: *this project was going on*)
2. Student T took a freshman seminar class from Professor A (18-21).
3. Student T discussed the project with Professor A (23-25).
4. Student T committed to being involved in the project (16-17, 28).
5. Student T and his co-researcher applied for research grants (31).
6. Delays occurred in the creation of the website (47-48).
7. Student T and his co-researcher did research on the website (53-57).

*Other background information (no chronology):*
Professor A wanted somebody to evaluate the website (26-27)

To determine which are main events and which are background *orientation*, it is important to determine both the purpose of the narrative and in what order the events are given. Sacks says that the events being reported are the ones most tellable in the situation, and other events and information merely frame it (1992, p. 236). This narrative is a personal sequence of events that T tells within the larger spectrum of the presentation on the research. He gives the personal narrative because it is relevant to why he should be presenting, rather than the Professor. This situation tells us that Event 1 (the Professor's involvement in the research) is not a "main event" of T's story, because it is already assumed/known by the recipients: Professor A has already reported on this very project for nearly fifteen minutes leading up to T's story. Also eliminated from the "main events" is Event 6 (delays occurred in the creation of the website, lines 47-48). This event is not personal to T, nor does it answer any part of "How I got involved". Instead, this event is included because the presentation handout (see Appendix H) has specific dates on it, referring to when the project was done. Since T's chronological placement of the events of his involvement would be inconsistent without mentioning the delay (Event 5 happens *in the fall of 2007 and…it was for the spring of 2008,* lines 44-45), he adds Event 6 to situate his narrative of personal involvement in a timeline consistent with the dates the audience have been told (i.e., their preexisting knowledge).

I gave this narrative the title "how I got involved in research evaluating a website," because that is what it accomplishes – informing the audience of the events that transpired that got T involved in the research project. Because of this purpose, it is easy to see lines 16-17 as an abstract, even though such an abstract has already been given by

Professor A (lines 1-2). The abstract given in 16-17 is given like an event, but it is evident through the other events that it is made up of a series of events, one of which I have called "committing to being involved". This abstract is bundled and placed in the chronology in 16-17 and again in 28, between which occur three items: Event 2 (18-21), Event 3 (23-25), and situational information (26-27). *Orientation* clauses help "identify…the time, place, persons, and their activity or situation" (Labov, 1972, p. 364). They can occur right at the beginning, but tend to occur in a section of multiple clauses. Consistent with this, orientation is found for time (*my freshman year*, 17; *after being in Professor Cavitz's seminar*, 18-21; *after discussing with him for a while throughout the semester,* 23-24; *that's where I came along,* 28), for place (*Professor Cavitz's seminar*), for persons (*I'm Toby,* 13; *Professor Cavitz,* 20; *my co-researcher Lars White,* 29), and the situation (*this project was going on,* 25; *he wanted somebody to come in and evaluate the website,* 26-27).

These orientations (with the exception of one character, *Lars White* in 29) are all found between the abstract event of 16-17 and its chronological placement in 28. Rather than using a temporal word like "then," T used "after" several times (18, 23) to place these events in their order, along with "that's where" (28) to show these background events' relation to the main event of Getting Involved. After this main event is established, T uses the handout to outline the rest of his narrative.

The only thing that T is working from in the relation of these events is two lines on the handout (Appendix H, slide 17):

> "Purpose: evaluating the effectiveness of the website.
> University grant in Spring 2008, along with Lars White".

It is not surprising, then, that repetition of pieces or the entirety of these phrases can be found multiple times in his relation of the events: *our purpose like I said was to evaluate the effectiveness of the website* (lines 41-42). Pieces of this are found in other places: *evaluate this website,* 27; *evaluate the website, see how effective it is for students,* 34-35; and *research on the actual effectiveness of the website,* 54-55. Parts of "University grant in Spring 2008" are also found: *we both applied for University grants,* 31, and *we got our grant in the- we applied for it in the fall of 2007 and it was for spring 2008,* 43-45. While the events and background information serve to answer the question of "How I got involved", the handout is important to this narrative because it is guiding the inclusion and word choice of the events and orientation given.

In this presentation, information about T's involvement in the project is given before the narrative (Professor A introduces T in line 2, and cues him directly in line 9), in the handout, and finally in T's narrative. An abstract is given by a non-narrator who is not a first-time recipient of the information (1-8), making A neither co-teller nor recipient. Orientation is used to sort the less important events around the main event. Repetition is used to stay on (or return to) the pre-arranged series of events. Let us now compare the outlined (yet somewhat haphazard) sequence of this narrative to that of the following Informational narrative occurring in conversation.

*Information in Conversational Narrative: "How Uzbekistan Became the Strictest Country in Central Asia"*[9]

Leading up to this narrative, G has been telling W about his recent trip to Central Asia, and his future plans to move and work there. Prior to this excerpt, W has stated that he doesn't *know much of anything about Kyrgyzstan* (lines 3-6 of Transcript 2):

**(Transcript 2)**[8] **L5900ENG7m12m1, 4:05-4:20**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | W: | now- (0.5) |
| 2 | G: | (inaudible) |
| 3 | W: → | {tsk} I don't know (.) |
| 4 | → | I admittedly do not kno:w |
| 5 | → | much of anything |
| 6 | → | about Kyrgyzstan=I- |
| 7 | | *could* locate the general vicinity=of=it |
| 8 | G: | Mmhmm? |
| 9 | W: | On a map? (0.3) um |
| 10 | | It's one=o'=those=places= |
| 11 | | That=I've=noted=as places |
| 12 | | that people don't really acknowledge even exist |
| 13 | | //because it's\|\| |
| 14 | G: | //@hmhmm!@\|\| |
| 15 | W: | just kind of there=like (0.3) |
| 16 | | like what's the lay of the land like there |
| 17 | | what kind of terrain is it |

This is an example of a potential-recipient-produced Knowledge Gap, because W is overtly stating that he does not know *much of anything* on the topic of (at least) *Kyrgyzstan*. W asks G about the geography of the country (lines 16-17), the first of two questions that W asks G between Transcripts 2 and 3 (the second question is about language). While talking about the ethnic and linguistic makeup of Kyrgyzstan, G mentions that *there's a lot of tension* and *it's a bit tense sometimes* between different people groups (marked with arrows in 2-4, 15-17), specifying that these tensions exist in Kyrgyzstan between the Kyrgyz and Uzbeks (3, 5-6, 10, 13-17).

**(Transcript 3)**[8] **L5900ENG7m12m1, 6:20-6:50**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | And so there's- |
| 2 | → | there's a lot of tension over like- |
| | → | ((gesturing sorting with hands |
| | → | moving over one another)) |
| 3 | → | who's gonna do what=c'z=i=mean-=there's- |
| 4 | → | in that region, |
| 5 | | you've got=even=in=Kyrgyzstan |
| 6 | | most of that region is still Uzbek. |
| 7 | | (0.5) a:h so: |
| 8 | | (0.3) It's- it's- |
| 9 | | Kind of a (.) |
| 10 | | They=don't=really like each other? |
| 11 | | //@hunhuhhm!@\|\| |
| 12 | W: | //Mmhmm?\|\| |
| 13 | G: | And they haven't for a long time? |
| 14 | | Uh: so it's kind of a- |
| 15 | → | It's a little bit tense sometimes |
| 16 | → | Not- not super violent, |
| 17 | → | jus- discriminatory:, |
| 18 | | And (you know, that sorta thing) |
| 19 | | Which is kinda funny |
| 20 | | (.) cuz, y'know |
| 21 | | (.) they're related peoples, |

In the four minutes between Transcripts 3 and 4[9], W's second question is about the languages in the area. G answers these, and then, to go from general information questions about language to his prospective story, G establishes his personal connection, by talking about his wife's experience working for a non-government organization (NGO) in – and then being kicked out of – Uzbekistan.

**(Transcript 4)**[8] **L5900ENG7m12m1, 10:30-11:17**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | It's- it's interesting, cuz |
| 2 | | (1.0) u:m my *wife* speaks Uzbek. |
| 3 | | Because she: spent time in Uzbekistan |
| 4 | | With the *peace* corps. |
| 5 | W: | Nice. |
| 6 | G: | Um, and- |
| 7 | | Before Uzbekistan closed its doors |
| 8 | | And said |
| | | ((palm forward moving right)) |
| 9 | | We don't want *ANY* westerners here |
| 10 | | (.) u:h the peace corps was=(like) |
| 11 | | The *first* to go. |
| 12 | W: | mmhmn. |
| 13 | | @huh!@ hh.a:nd |
| 14 | | Cuz=you=know they're- |
| | | ((shaking head)) |
| 15 | | (.) terrible people! |
| 16 | | @hheh!@ th- the- |
| 17 | | Uh, Uzbekistan is the- is=the |
| 18 | | Is politically (.) the worst (0.4) country |
| 19 | | In=that- in that region? |
| 20 | | As far as human rights an' |
| 21 | | They're basically, they've basically |
| 22 | | Returned to a totalitarian regime. |
| 23 | | (.6) U:m. (0.4) |
| 24 | | They never REALLY left it, u:m |
| 25 | | But- they *tried* to leave it? |
| 26 | | and then {ssst} came back to it? |
| 27 | | Y'know. |

The main event (*the Peace Corps was like the first to go,* 10-11) is an abstract for the upcoming story in Transcript 5. It is both topical cohesion (unrest in Central Asia) and knowledge offer, as G is now free to give the following narrative of "how Uzbekistan became the strictest government in Central Asia" (stated in 69-71 of Transcript 5), made tellable by G's connection to someone who was kicked out (G's wife, lines 2-4 of Transcript 4), and by an expressed gap of knowledge about the area (lines 3-6 of Transcript 2).

**(Transcript 5)**[8] **L5900f09ENG7m12m1, 11:18-13:30**
**"How Uzbekistan became the strictest country in Central Asia",**
G=graduate student, W=undergraduate student

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | When the (0.6) when the Russian Federation |
| 2 | | (1.0) finally said |
| | | ((waving the back of the hand)) |
| 3 | | you're all on your own, |
| 4 | | in 1993, um, |
| 5 | | all these countries became |
| 6 | | (.) you=know, not just- (.) like (.) |
| | | ((making quotation marks with fingers)) |
| 7 | | "autonomous republics", but=like straight up- |
| 8 | | (0.5) internationally recognized countries. |
| 9 | | (0.6) so there're still |
| | | ((making quotation marks with fingers)) |
| 10 | | "autonomous republics" within (0.3) Russia |
| 11 | | (0.3) today, |
| 12 | | (0.4) um, but uh, |
| 13 | | like y'know Irkutsk=and |
| 14 | | (.) u:h=Dagestan |
| 15 | | there's=a=bunch=of others=but |
| 16 | | (.) u:m. (0.9) but |
| 17 | | (0.5) but the=a:h |
| 18 | | (0.3) these particular ones (are) uh: |
| 19 | | (.) on the outskirts with large |
| 20 | | (1.0) a large nationalist majority? |
| 21 | | (0.3) um (.) |
| 22 | | Uzbeks and Kyrgyz and Kazakhs |
| 23 | | all became their own countries, but- |
| 24 | | (0.3) the governments=didn't=change=at=all. |
| 25 | | (0.3) the peop-=the person that=was=in |
| 26 | | power under th-=under=the USSR, |
| 27 | | (.) stayed in power. |
| 28 | | (0.5) now in recent years |
| 29 | | in the last four or five years |
| 30 | | a few of them |
| 31 | | (.) have had coups, and |
| 32 | | (0.3) uh: (0.3) |
| 33 | | and the new |
| | | ((moving hand forward)) |
| 34 | | person=has=taken over. |
| 35 | | (0.5) uh: Kyrgyzstan was one of those. |
| 36 | | (0.3) u:m (.) in 2005. |
| 37 | | while my- while=my=wife was there |
| 38 | | @xhuhuh@ a::h |
| 39 | | (.) and (0.3) u::hh |
| 40 | | (0.5) the- |
| 41 | | (.) all the other, |
| 42 | | (0.4) like, dictators were |
| 43 | | (.) scared (.) |
| 44 | | that w- it=was=gonna happen in their country |
| 45 | | and so they (.) did all kinds of |
| 46 | | (.) you=know house-cleaning |
| 47 | | (0.3) and, uh crack down on things |
| 48 | | (.) and uh blamed, |
| 49 | | (.) uhm th-=the coup that happened in Kyrgyzstan, |
| 50 | | (0.4) which was called the Tulip Revolution, |
| 51 | | u:m they, th-the the ousted leader blamed it |
| 52 | | (.) on non-government=organizations |
| 53 | | like the Peace Corps things=like=that saying |
| | | ((pointing with index finger)) |
| 54 | | they've been t- they've been inciting |
| 55 | | (0.4) people to do this. |
| 56 | | (0.3) y'know and so, that blame |
| 57 | | (.) spread to the- these other |
| 58 | | countries=an=y'know=(all=the=other=di)ctators're=like |
| 59 | | well |
| | | ((holding palms forward)) |
| 60 | | I don't wanna leave these guys here |
| 61 | | (0.3) y'know |
| | | ((counting on fingers)) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 62 | | take all the (.) non-government organizations |
| 63 | | (they) take all the non-profit organizations |
| 64 | | (.) get 'em outta here, |
| 65 | | they could be missionaries |
| 66 | | they could be spies they could be- |
| 67 | | y'know whatever=whatever=whatever? |
| 68 | W: | yeah. |
| 69 | G: | and (0.3) so |
| 70 | | (.) Uzbekistan was=th- |
| 71 | | was=the strictest on those and- |
| 72 | | (.) a:i all (o=em) left. |
| 73 | W: | an' they- they |
| 74 | | adopted a completely isolationist policy? |
| 75 | G: | basically. you can still... |
| | | *G explains how to get a visa to visit Uzbekistan and other Central Asian countries* |

W's statement prior to this sequence (*I admittedly do not know much of anything about Kyrgyzstan*) is evidence of a Knowledge Gap, requesting (or at least allowing) any relevant information to be passed along about Central Asia. G makes his story relevant by transitioning to talk about the government's recent actions, via the personal connection of his wife being there when it happened. The more specific Knowledge Gap is more implicit, though the gist of it is explicitly asked in the clarification question in 73-74, after the narrative is completed. The implicit question that this narrative answers is something to the effect of "how did Uzbekistan become the strictest country in Central Asia,"[10] which G essentially states in 69-71 in an evaluative Coda (a conclusion that summarizes the story, and may also include an evaluation such as a moral; Hatch, 1992, p. 166). The sequence of events serves to answer this question, and these events are listed below in chronological order, which in this case also coincides with narrative order.

Sequence of events to inform W "how Uzbekistan became the strictest country in Central Asia" (lines from Transcript 5)

1. Russian federation dismisses Central Asian nations (1-3)
2. Nations become independent states (4-8)
3. Previous sub-dictators became default dictators (24-27)
4. Some countries had coups / new people have taken over (28-31, 33-34)
5. Dictators cracked down on freedoms (42-47)
6. Ousted dictators blamed NGOs for inciting coups (48-49, 51-55)
7. Current dictators get scared and evict NGOs (62-64)
8. NGO members left (72)

This series of events serves to provide W with the information he did not previously have, using the chronological series of events to fill the Knowledge Gap. W shows that he has followed G with his summary and request for further information in 73-74. G repeatedly confirms circumstances throughout, making sure that W is following with the large number of uses of the tag question *y'know* in this narrative (6, 13, 46, 56, 58, 61, and 67), one of which even elicits W's confirmation in 68.

As Szatrowski (in press) summarized in Table 1, gestures can be a useful tool for evaluation. Polanyi indicates that every evaluative tool can also be used non-evaluatively (1985, p. 14). G uses gestures that emphasize or illustrate the event sequence, rather than overtly evaluating anything: *waving the back of the hand* in 2-3 represents the dismissal in Event 1; *moving hand forward* to symbolize continuance in 33-34 is Event 4, *pointing with index finger* as the accusation in 53-55 is Event 6, and *holding palms forward* as if being defensive in 59-60 is situation orientation for Event 7. The *counting on fingers* in 62 emphasizes the list of NGOs that were ousted, and the reasons for mistrusting them. The only gesture that does not emphasize a specific event is actually an indication of tone (*making quotation marks with fingers* in 6-7 and 9-10), to show that *autonomous republics* was a loosely-used, somewhat ironic term. This is the only obvious evaluative gesture; all the rest emphasize the event sequence, further showing that the event sequence is the important aspect of this narrative.

*Common Features of Informational Narrative*

There are similarities and differences between the lecture narrative and the conversational narrative so far described. First, both narrators are privy to the knowledge of the events, and the listeners are not. A slight difference found in the presentation data

is that Professor A, who is privy to the events, can introduce Student T's narrative, but Professor A is not involved in the narration after that at all. In both narratives, the potential recipients' lack of knowledge on the topic is evidenced prior to the narration. This disparity, which I call a *Knowledge Gap*, between "privy" and "not privy" participants can be revealed in at least four ways:

> (1) through a Knowledge Question from the potential teller, or an explicit question from the potential listener (*an' they adopted a completely isolationist policy?* in line 73-74 of Transcript 4);
> (2) by a statement by the potential recipient (as in W's statement in lines 2-3 of Transcript 2: *I admittedly know almost nothing about Kyrgyzstan*);
> (3) by an offer or preface (Groundwork) from the teller (or in the case of the presentation, the introducer: *What Toby's gonna describe to you is*); or,
> (4) by an unusual situation that implies an unspoken question (in the case of the presentation, "why is Toby presenting?").

Usually, establishing the Knowledge Gap is done before the narrative begins, to create the tellability the story, but it could potentially happen during a narrative if the recipient notes their lack of knowledge about something being said (e.g., *I've never heard that before*, line 190 in Transcript 11, "Delusions of grandeur"). Thus, narrative promises to pass on information from those privy to those not privy.

Second, the informational narrative answers an informational question. This "question" is really a Knowledge Gap, and as such can be explicitly stated, or established retroactively, as was the case with the summaries in 69-72 and 73-74 in "how Ubekistan became the strictest country in Central Asia". This particular case of retroactive summary of the Knowledge Question is a result of the Knowledge Gap being so broad (*I know almost nothing),* which opens the door of relevance to whatever narrative the teller wants to tell (he uses one that is still relevant to the experiences of the persons involved). In the case of the lecture narrative, the informational question to be answered does not

need to be explicitly stated by the speakers or recipients, but is established by the situation. It is understood by everyone present that this very question ("How I got involved in research evaluating a website") is part of the purpose of T's portion of the presentation. The narrative's tellability comes from the Knowledge Gap in both cases, but note that in the context of a research presentation, it may be less important to establish tellability to the captive audience. It is the purpose of the storyteller (in this case, to relay information) that determines the category of the narrative.

When looking for the informational question in the above narratives, note that there is not a large amount of evaluation. The answers to the information question will be filled in not by evaluation, but by events, either in the main sequence or in orientation. I propose the following summary of common features of informational narrative, as well as situations which would disqualify a narrative from being informational:

Table 4: Features of an Informational Narrative

| **Features that qualify:** | **Features that disqualify:** |
|---|---|
| • Potential recipient(s) do(es) not have prior knowledge of events told by narrator.<br>WHERE TO LOOK: "Knowledge Gap" evidenced by Knowledge Question or Groundwork by narrator, revelation from recipient, or implied by an unusual situation.<br><br>• Answers either an implied or explicitly asked informational question: who did what? how? what happened? when? in what order?<br>WHERE TO LOOK: Answers will be found in the events and background info, **not** in evaluations or hypotheticals. | • Events were shared by or already known to listener – no new information is transferred.<br>• Hypothetical narrative – events did not actually happen[11] |
| **Optional features to look for:**<br>• Evidence of misunderstanding or lack of prior knowledge from listener: *I know almost nothing about Central Asia*, *Mmhmm?*, *Oh really?, I've never heard THAT before*<br>WHERE TO LOOK: Listener feedback such as clarification questions; Potential recipients' statements and questions prior to narrative<br>• Information question (by either participant) or offer (by prospective teller): *What [I'm] gonna describe to you is*<br>WHERE TO LOOK: Both recipients' utterances just prior to the narrative | |

Other possible stories that could theoretically be considered Informational might include "What I did at school today" or "How I fixed the bathroom sink." Their tellability comes mainly from the disparity of knowledge between teller and recipient, and this disparity is evidenced by Knowledge Questions, Groundwork, and Orientation, either before, during, or after the narrative.

### *Illustrative Narrative*

In this section, I look at two narratives that do more than inform. Takahashi's (in press) definition of Illustration narratives is at its core equivalent to mine: "narratives that are preceded by an assessment, and provide an explanation for or give an example related to that assessment" (p. 4). However, I also include in my Illustrative narrative definition part of what Takahashi calls "Elaboration" (see Table 2 for a summary of these functions). His sub-categories of Detail, Review/Preview, and Epitome work well for lecture discourse, but do not transfer well to casual conversation. Detail and Review/Preview both relate to previous and following lecture topics, but the idea of Illustration narrative that I define actually relates well to the initial (or final) assessment. Takahashi's idea of Epitome works in this case, as these are stories that "support an abstract idea or general comment" (p. 8).

Since my categories overlap with and are slightly broader than Takahashi's, I shall call his "assessment" a *thesis*, and the "explanation for or example related to" the thesis I shall call *evidence supporting the thesis*. This allows for the large amount of evaluation found in Illustration narrative, including (but not limited to) evaluative codas

like in Takahashi's Epitome. These evaluations support the thesis as much as the narrative itself.

*Illustration in Lecture Narrative: "Clip Art"*

In this narrative, Professor A has been describing the media features of the website, and is talking specifically about graphics. This leads him to a short narrative about graphics, found in lines 15-38 (in bold on left). The thesis is stated (marked with arrows) in lines 20-23 and repeated in 37-38, and there are supporting evaluations found (underlined) within the narrative.

**(Transcript 6)**[8] **LING5900STORY10m9m1, 10:30-12:40**
**"Clip art"**
A = professor; X = others in classroom (unidentifiable)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | A: | hhh (.5) for those of you who've been on the |
| 2 | | website, |
| 3 | | you'll notice that we have VIDEO? ( |
| 4 | | 1.0) we have hours of video, |
| 5 | | but we had to be very careful. (.) |
| 6 | | we *OD* on too much video, don't we= |
| 7 | | =if=you=go=to a website |
| 8 | | and there are too many video cuts, |
| 9 | | you get *tired*. (.3) |
| 10 | | so we: wanted=to keep them SHORT? |
| 11 | | (.4) and we wanted=to keep them FRIENDLY? |
| 12 | | (.4) aa:::nd we=don't=have=any=that=goes=on for |
| 13 | | more tha:n a minute=or two. |
| 14 | | O::k. (.) and then we=have=*audio*, |
| **15** | | (.3) you notice we have a lotta pictures of |
| **16** | | people? |
| **17** | | (.) we originally had clip art. |
| **18** | | and our advisers told us *NO*. use actual people= |
| **19** | | =we got their permission= |
| **20** | → | =and it makes it *friendlier* doesn't it? |
| **21** | → | to have faces of rw@*real*@ human beings |
| **22** | → | as opposed to: the::se nerdy type thing- |
| **23** | → | =people=like? //(.4) {tss} hh@hhh@\|\| |
| **24** | X: | //{@hhuhh@}\|\| |
| **25** | A: | i have=a- I have=a::mm {tsk} I have a=uh: |
| **26** | | online website for um uh:=a web COURSE |
| **27** | | on uh=assessing uh=language (.) ability |
| **28** | | and=uh .hh eh::=it's with Hampton Publishers, |
| **29** | | and they insisted on using these nerdy clip art |
| **30** | | thing-z=sa=h=thum- some=o'=them i find *very* |
| **31** | | offensive. and //i say don't use this\|\|= |
| **32** | X: | //{hmmm!}\|\| |
| **33** | A: | =don't use this=lookit=this=it'sa cari- iz=like= |
| **34** | | =a horrible *ca:*ricature of somebody, (.3) |
| **35** | | so they cleaned it up a bit but they insist on |
| **36** | | using this=this clip art which I- (.5) |
| **37** | → | so=I=dn=know we=were=using real people, that's |
| **38** | → | good. (.3) |
| 39 | | we ALSO used something called a cyber pad. have |
| 40 | | any=of=you=seen a cyber pad, (.3) |
| 41 | | it looks like a *tablet* |
| | | ((hands flat together out front)) (.3) |
| 42 | | and what we wanted to get at was BRAIN dumps. |
| 43 | | we wanted to get what was *I:N* the *HEA:D* of the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 44 | | *LEAR:NER*, (.) so, we had them scrawl down. |
| 45 | | so that duwit?= |
| | | ((pointing to "duwit" on handout)) |
| 46 | | =you see the duwit? that's- we used a cyber pad. |
| 47 | | (.3) that's the student actually scratching down, |
| 48 | | (.) th=the way they store that material in their |
| 49 | | mind, (.3) that's their strategy, |
| 50 | | and we=we sent it right to the computer. (1.6) |
| 51 | | that's a cyber pad. so we used VIDEO: AUDIO: CYBER |
| 52 | | pad material, we used various um |
| 53 | | d-=MEA:NS to get the material uh:: into the- onto |
| 54 | | the website. aa:nd u:hh (.) |
| 55 | | u:m (.3) the usability (.) study we did the summer |
| 56 | | of two thousand=n=EIGHT, was focused |
| 57 | | on what students thought of our graphics. |
| 58 | | and we did clean up our graphics=some because we |
| 59 | | did get some feedback. =people had (.) → had |
| 60 | | issues with=some of our graphics.← ((swallows)) |
| 61 | | {tsk} hh NAVigating our website. (.) .hh OKAY. so |
| 62 | | then finally |
| | | ((reading)) |
| 63 | | I NEED to enhance my grammar strategy |
| 64 | | rept-=repertoi::re, |
| | | ((continues to read handout on website layout)) |

The thesis is stated explicitly (*It makes it friendlier, doesn't it, to have pictures of real human beings as opposed to these nerdy type people?* 20-23), and also concludes the story in an evaluative coda in 37-38. This bookends the narrative to show the reason it was told – to exemplify why *pictures of real human beings* are better than clip art. Within the narrative, Professor A uses evaluative words like *friendlier, real, nerdy, offensive, horrible,* and *caricature* throughout, exposing/expressing his own views that align with the thesis. The more provocative of these evaluations gets a rise out of the recipients: *nerdy* draws a laugh in 24, and *offensive* gets a noticeable reaction from at least one student in the audience in 32.

The tellability of this narrative comes from its topical cohesion rather than a knowledge question – the general idea of "the use of pictures or clip art on a website" in 15-19 establishes the connection for this narrative. Rather than informing the audience of an irrelevant story that answers "how we came to have pictures of real people and not clip art", Professor A uses this narrative as a way to make a point. This example is perfectly in line with Takahashi's Illustration criteria: "provides an explanation/example of a

previous abstract idea...provides support for the professor's previous view" (p. 25) Professor A essentially "teaches" the students that (i.e., he argues that) "it's better to use photographs of real people than to use clip art."[12]

Let us see how the thesis (and repetition of the thesis) and the evaluations of this presentation narrative compare to the following narrative from conversation.

*Illustration in Conversational Narrative: "Mexmon-ing"*

In this narrative, G is talking to W about the cultural values of Central Asians, especially in regard to neighborly visits. In Central Asia, there is a custom of stopping by unannounced at neighbor's houses, at which point they are culturally obligated to invite the visitor in and serve them tea and/or food. This custom is called *mexmon* 'guest' in Uzbek, and G adds the English suffix *-ing* to show that it is a verb, and also to add irony, marking it as unusual and therefore more tellable (Sacks, 1984; 1992). The word "guesting" does not appear in English (perhaps because we do not necessarily practice this custom), so it certainly qualifies as unusual. He states, prior to this narrative, two possible theses. The first is *the whole region is really neighbor-connected*, seen about a minute and a half prior to the narrative:

**(Transcript 7) L5900ENG7m12m1, 17:45-17:55**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 33 | G: | And, y'know, we'd really |
| 34 | | (.) relate to the Uzbeks, |
| 35 | | um, u:h on a day=t'=day basis. |
| 36 | → | (0.3) y'know, they- the whole region is very um |
| 37 | → | (1.4) u:h neighbor connected? |
| 38 | W: | Yeah. |
| 39 | G: | To- um=um |
| 40 | | (0.7) like (.) they do something they call mexmon-ing? |
| 41 | | which is- which basically means guesting? |
| 42 | W: | 'kay? |

The second (and more likely) possible thesis is *it can be very inconvenient, but it's incredibly taboo to refuse*, seen shortly after this:

**(Transcript 8) L5900ENG7m12m1, 18:18-18:48**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 58 | G: | //Completely|| uninvited, |
| 59 | | unplanned. |
| 60 | W: | Just=kinda=be=like |
| | | ((waving)) |
| 61 | | "hey what's up" |
| 62 | G: | Yeah. and it can be, |
| 63 | → | and=y'kn-=that's=the thing, |
| 64 | → | is it can be (0.4) very inconvenient, |
| 65 | → | but it's incredibly taboo to refuse. |
| 66 | | (1.0) u:m. so: (tsk) there are wa:ys to refu:se, |
| 67 | | uh I haven't heard them all yet, |
| 68 | | but it's not- you wouldn't refuse, you'd bring them in |
| 69 | | and serve them tea, and then try to somehow enter into |
| 70 | | the conversation that |
| 71 | | (.) uh talks about what you're doing at the moment |
| 72 | | (.) that they might be interrupting. |
| 73 | W: | So VERY indirect! |
| 74 | G: | @VERY!@ Very indirect. |

This second thesis is even emphasized with a focused discourse marker *and that's the thing,* which can serve to show that this is an important point. In the following transcript it becomes apparent that this is the main thesis, even if the other is also included.

Between these possible theses and the narrative in the following transcription, G gives W the definition of "*mexmon*-ing" (see Appendix D for the full transcript of this section). The narrative in 107-172 covers a specific example of the practice. As in "Clip Art", evaluations that serve as *evidence for the thesis* have been underlined (using the thesis from lines 64-65 above).

**(Transcript 9) LING5900f09ENG7m12m1, 19:16-21:13**
**"*Mexmon*-ing"**
*Context: G is describing to W a specific instance of the Central Asian custom of inviting oneself over for tea or dinner.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 107 | G: | But- (0.3) but=yeah, it's=a: |
| 108 | | (.) there=were=a=number=o'=times that- |
| 109 | | people'd come by. |
| 110 | | One=of='em=was=like- the |
| 111 | | (0.3) l- one=o'=th=*last* nights we were there, and |
| 112 | | (0.6) we=were kinda debriefing |
| 113 | | (.) our time there, (with uh (.) with) our hosts and- |
| 114 | | (0.4) and they were uh: |
| 115 | | (.) y'know we=were=all jus' 'xhau:sted and ev'rything |
| 116 | | ts@hh!@omeone came @by::@ and |
| 117 | | .hhh! y'know |
| | | ((shaking head)) |
| 118 | | (0.6) an'=it's like {aughh!} |
| | | ((gestures frustration, fingers to face)) |
| 119 | | it's like ten at night 'r=something, y'kno:w |
| 120 | W: | //@hmmh!@|| |
| 121 | G: | //@huh@|| we're trying t'=have a meeting and |
| 122 | W: | go to *bed*, y'kno:w, |
| 123 | G: | Mmhmm |
| 124 | | We all=gotta get up at like five in the morning |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 125 | | cuz=we're driving |
| 126 | | (0.3) twelve hours (y'know, across the country) |
| 127 | | (0.4) @heh!@ so it's i'=was |
| 128 | | (0.4) it was interesting. |
| 129 | | But yeah. They brought 'em in an', |
| 130 | | served them tea and |
| 131 | | (.) *offered* them food, |
| 132 | | an'=o'=course |
| 133 | | (0.6) y'know |
| 134 | | (0.3) the- |
| 135 | | (0.4) if=yer=*in=that* |
| 136 | | if you're in the right conversation, |
| 137 | | (0.5) you'll offer 'em tea, but they'll also realize |
| 138 | | what they're:: |
| | | ((gestures reciprocal give-and-take)) |
| 139 | | (1.5) like, butting in on? |
| 140 | W: | Mmhmm. |
| 141 | G: | B't=they=were=there t'=ask for money. |
| 142 | | (0.3) an'=that's- that's- |
| 143 | | (0.6) difficult because |
| 144 | | (0.4) u:m (.) they=don'=us'ally=*do* that. |
| 145 | | (0.3) uh but they were in a spot where: someone hadta |
| 146 | | go=like |
| 147 | | their kid hadta go=ta Moscow for somethi:ng, |
| 148 | | whatever, and |
| 149 | W: | //Mmhmm.\|\| |
| 150 | G: | //just-\|\| |
| 151 | | (.) SO ah=they: |
| 152 | | (1.0) {tsk} they=ended=up |
| 153 | | (.) giving them money, |
| 154 | | (0.3) then they returned like an hour later, |
| 155 | | (1.1) wher- served=them=tea *again*, |
| 156 | | and they- they said we=found- we=found |
| 157 | | (.) money for (.) for them, we don't |
| 158 | | (0.4) need so (they gave the money back.) |
| 159 | W: | O:kay. |
| 160 | G: | So:=it=was it=was an interesting thing |
| 161 | | cuz th's- |
| 162 | | that's not something that happens all the time. |
| 163 | → | (0.8) but just=th- just=the fact they brought them in, |
| 164 | → | sat them down and gave them tea an' |
| 165 | | (0.4) y'know fruit an' |
| 166 | | (0.5) bread and things like that, |
| 167 | → | (0.4) y'know (.) every time that they came to the |
| 168 | → | door, |
| 169 | W: | y@heah!@ |
| 170 | G: | y'know? An' it's like |
| 171 | | here we stand at our door and we're like YEAH? |
| 172 | | @hiyhheh!@ whattaya want? @hehe!@ (3.0) |

If this were merely an informational narrative, it would only serve to give an example that this practice exists (i.e., "the time that some neighbors came over and asked for money"). Instead, there are many evaluations throughout the narrative that serve to support the thesis "It can be inconvenient, but it's incredibly taboo to refuse." These include all the reasons why this instance was inconvenient (underlined in lines 115, 117-119, 121-122, 124-126), and the places that it was taboo to refuse (*you'll offer 'em tea*,

136-137, *jus' the fact they brought them in, sat them down and gave them tea* 163-164, *every time they came to the door*, 167, and contrasted with U.S. culture in 171-172). In all these lines, words like *exhausted* and *butting in*, as well as the situations that the characters were in (*ten at night*, *trying t'have a meeting*, *gotta get up at like five*) serve to support the thesis of it being inconvenient. Gestures and non-linguistic utterances are used to show the inconvenience, such as the sighs in 116-117, the *shaking of the head* in 117-118, and the cry *aughhh!* along with *hands to the face* in 118-119.

Supporting the other possible thesis (the more general *The whole region is really neighbor-connected*) are some repetitions of the practice being *interesting* (128 and 160). Along with the contrast with U.S. culture in 171-172, this story could be considered an example of how the region is really neighbor-connected, as opposed to the U.S., where we *stand at our door an' we're like YEAH, whattaya want?* At the very least, the custom (if not the story) of *mexmon-ing* is related to the region being neighbor connected.

There is far more evidence, however, that it is the inconvenience thesis that is in focus here. G uses the phrase *that's the thing* (63 of Transcript 8) to set this thesis apart. The listener, W, shows that he interprets the "inconvenient" thesis as the one being presented: almost every time that W contributes, it is following a piece of evidence that supports this thesis. He reacts a laughing *hmmh!* in 120, with *mmhmm* in 123, 140, and 149, and *yheah!* in 169.

*Features of an Illustrative Narrative*

Unlike the merely Informational narratives, Illustrative narrative revolves less around the events, and more around the central thesis assessment and its supporting evaluations. In an Informational narrative, the listener is receiving information about a

sequence of events to which he was not privy (which are given as facts rather than as something to evaluate), and therefore does not have the authority to contradict or disagree with the events laid out by the teller. In illustrative narrative, however, the listener is focused on the thesis, and can either agree with the teller (123, 140, 149 and 169 in "*mexmon*-ing") or disagree. While disagreement with the thesis is not preferred (that is, it is the "structurally unexpected next act" in this case, after an assessment; Yule, 1996, p. 79), it would be more appropriate than a rejection of the events themselves. This suggests that the listener has more authority to disagree with a thesis than to contradict the actually experienced events of the teller. A listener's disagreement would just be another evaluation in an Illustrative narrative, whereas a dispute of the events halts the story entirely. The laugher in line 24 of "Clip art" might just be laughing at the word *nerdy*, but X could be evaluating the thesis one way or the other. Both the teller and the recipient have the right to an opinion on the thesis, and therefore a right to evaluate it.

In both illustrative narratives, the thesis is presented (considerably earlier in the conversational narrative "*Mexmon*-ing" than in the lecture narrative "Clip art") and then supported by the narrative and its evaluations. The thesis is restated briefly in each narrative in an evaluative coda (37-38 in "Clip art" and 136-139 and 163-168 in "*Mexmon*-ing"). I outline the common features of an Illustrative narrative in Table 5, as well as features that would disqualify a narrative from being Illustrative.

Table 5: Features of an Illustrative Narrative

| **Features that qualify:** | **Features that disqualify:** |
|---|---|
| • A thesis statement, often stated either in the abstract or before the narrative begins.<br>• Evaluation in the narrative supports the thesis as evidence for it.<br>• Thesis is (usually) re-iterated in an evaluative coda. If not in a coda, there may be reiterations in other evaluations within the narrative.[13]<br>• Listener has authority to agree or disagree (not necessarily verbally) with the thesis and any of its evaluations.<br>• Could potentially be hypothetical, as a fable or parable (moral = evaluative coda). | • Lacks a thesis statement.<br>• Lacks evaluation.<br>• Lacks evaluative summary.<br>• Facts are presented, rather than something to evaluate; therefore, listener has no authority to agree or disagree. |
| **Features to look for:**<br>• Repetition of evaluations related to thesis: *friendlier*, *real people*, *nerdy*, *a caricature*<br>• Phrases like *For example*, *That's the thing*<br>• Codas that summarize and evaluate: *So that's good*, *So it was an interesting thing cuz…* | |

A good example of Illustrative narrative in practice is obviously Aesop's fables, which are created specifically to support a thesis that is then explicitly stated in the "moral" at the end. All the events of the narrative are interpreted, once the thesis has been given, in terms of this statement.

### *Evocative Narrative*

In this section I outline a third category of narrative, which goes beyond Information and Illustration, to the point that it seeks more to evoke emotion in the recipient. This emotion (or these emotions) is shared by the teller and (if successful) the recipient through the use of charged words within events, and through many kinds of evaluation (such as those described by Labov, 1972, and Szatrowski, in press). Through these devices, the listener can get a sense of the teller's "positive" or "negative" feelings towards a certain event or character of the story. Schiff and Noy (2006) give very good examples of this type of narrative in their Holocaust survivor subject's *life stories* –

deeply personal stories of important events in the teller's life, that rely on shared knowledge to connect with the listener. Both the stories analyzed in this section come from similar "life stories" that the teller has told multiple times before. "Delusions of Grandeur" in Transcript 11 is arguably a *second story*, (a related story whose tellability is established by the first story; Sacks 1992, vol. 1, p. 764), to "Restoration of Iraq" in Transcript 10, and therefore the transcriptions overlap to show their continuity.

Unlike the previous two categories, where I was able to compare Informational and Illustrative narratives from both casual conversation and research presentation, no examples of Evocative narrative occurred in the presentation data set. However, I am confident that with the collection of more lecture discourse data (in certain contexts or on certain topics), an example of Evocative narrative could be found. Rather that focusing on similarities and differences between classroom and conversational narrative, then, the following analysis will discuss the significance of these particular conversational narratives as "life stories".

*Conversational Narrative: "Restoration of Iraq"*

In this narrative, W has just asked G, "So what was it like when you first entered Baghdad?"[14] G has responded by describing first how the Iraqis reacted in the southern parts of Iraq (where the people were poorer and out of favor with Hussein), and then G shares the following narrative about a specific reaction by someone in Baghdad. There is a false start in 10, followed by some background information, and then the narrative starts again in 48 (marked with an arrow).

**(Transcript 10) LING5900f09ENG7m12m3**
**"Restoration of Iraq"**
*Context: G is describing the reaction of the Iraqi people to the 2003 U.S invasion.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | Once we got into Baghdad, |
| 2 | | uh we still=got=a=lot=o- of cheers, |
| 3 | | uh but one thing that we had |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | | (0.3) was just kinda a- |
| 5 | | it was a much clo:ser |
| 6 | | (0.9) uh:m |
| 7 | | (1.3) interaction with=the: |
| 8 | | with=the locals? |
| 9 | W: | Mhm |
| 10 | G:→ | I 'member one point um |
| 11 | | (1.1) u:hh=we saw people |
| | | ((gesturing back-and-forth)) |
| 12 | | walking by the same way every day, |
| 13 | | (y'know)=go get water, |
| 14 | | or food, or things like that, |
| 15 | | and we'd start t'=kinda, |
| 16 | | y'know, |
| | | ((waves)) |
| 17 | | wave at them, |
| 18 | | learn their names even, |
| 19 | | an'=things like that, |
| 20 | | which was cool →an' I'm really=glad=we=did=that← |
| 21 | | uh:m but=uh: |
| 22 | | some=of=the=kids would, |
| 23 | | um there=were- |
| 24 | | there=were=at least a few kids in each neighborhood |
| 25 | | that had learned some English? |
| 26 | W: | Hnyahp? |
| 27 | G: | Just- some, I mean y'know |
| 28 | W: | Hello, thank you, goodbye, |
| 29 | G: | Yeah, a few of them- |
| 30 | | a few of them had- |
| 31 | | naw, I=mean nehh'ey='d- |
| 32 | | some=o'=them='d=learned a little more than that. |
| 33 | | And every=now='n'=then |
| 34 | | you'd find someone that was from a |
| 35 | | (.) a wealthy family that had gone off to |
| 36 | | th'=University of Cairo or something and learned |
| 37 | | English very well |
| 38 | | (0.4) or studied even, |
| 39 | | in England or some'ing=like that. |
| 40 | | SO it's not unheard of=even=though |
| 41 | | (.) th' US and Iraq haven't had a whole lot of |
| 42 | | (.) //interaction,\|\| |
| 43 | W: | //yeahh.\|\| |
| 44 | G: | there've=been other |
| 45 | | (0.3) @hhuhh-hum!@ other places they've |
| 46 | | (.) they've gone to learn English um, |
| 47 | | (1.1) {tsk} so, .hhhh |
| 48 | → | (0.3) u:h=hhhh I remember one point, |
| 49 | | um, an old man coming up to us, |
| 50 | | and →of course he=didn't=speak=a← *word* of English, but |
| 51 | | he='ad brought his grandson with |
| 52 | | and his grandson had been |
| | | ((motioning back-and-forth with head movement)) |
| 53 | | back and forth |
| 54 | | (0.3) he='ad <u>brought us food</u> befo:re, |
| 55 | | stuff like that an' uh: |
| 56 | | (0.6) (just=a=lotta-) y'know, |
| 57 | | he='ad kin'=of, uh:m |
| 58 | | (0.3) we'd <u>kinda gotten to know 'im</u> a little bit, |
| 59 | | (0.3) and he spoke some English, and |
| 60 | | (0.3) .hh the old man was showing us this *book*. |
| 61 | | and it was like a |
| | | ((gesturing an open book)) |
| 62 | | (1.1) 't looked like a elementary school textbook |
| 63 | | (0.4) uhm. |
| 64 | | (0.5) an- (.) in=it were pictures |
| 65 | | (0.7) o:f |
| 66 | | (1.0) like |
| 67 | | (0.5) really (.) <u>nice looking</u> river banks, |
| 68 | | (y'know)=with, |
| 69 | | (0.3) um |
| 70 | | (0.5) y'know all kinds of <u>lush greenery</u> an' |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 71 | | (.) an' just wonderful- uh=y'- things |
| | | ((mimicking flipping through pages)) |
| 72 | | y'know- scenes from |
| 73 | | (.) *Iraq*=and *pict*ures, |
| 74 | | y'know not just drawings but pictures, um |
| 75 | | (0.4) of this wonderful Iraq |
| 76 | | (1.1) a:nd=it- through y'know through=uh broken |
| 77 | | English 'at his grandson was tryin' t'translate for |
| 78 | | us, um |
| 79 | | (0.9) he=w's: |
| 80 | | explaining that this was |
| 81 | | (0.5) *right* where we were standing. |
| 82 | | (1.0) um, |
| 83 | | (1.0) th=thirty years before. |
| 84 | W: | Hmm! |
| 85 | G: | Thirty to forty years before. |
| 86 | | (0.3) um |
| 87 | | (1.8) .hh hh=and I'm looking around |
| 88 | | and I'm seeing like, hardly any trees, 'n'=you=c'n=see |
| 89 | | th=the |
| 90 | | (.) y'know the=remnants of of nice like, |
| 91 | | roads and things like that but |
| 92 | | (0.3) →a lot of stuff of course is← |
| 93 | | (0.4) uhm |
| 94 | | (1.0) {tsk} *recent* |
| 95 | | (.) damages from the war, |
| 96 | | but most of it (.) is |
| 97 | | (0.3) just long gone |
| 98 | | (0.4) u:m the river is super polluted, |
| 99 | | u:m industry, industry, industry |
| 100 | | (y'know)=y- u:m y'know Saddam_Hussein was running the |
| 101 | | country much like |
| 102 | | (0.5) u:h |
| 103 | | (0.3) Hitler was running Nazi Germany? |
| 104 | | (.) just very |
| 105 | | (.) very *productive*, |
| 106 | | (0.4) bu:t at the expense of everything beautiful. |
| 107 | W: | //I see!\|\| |
| 108 | G: | //@hhhh!@\|\| u:m |
| 109 | | (0.3) and that's what he was |
| 110 | | getting across to us and- |
| 111 | | (0.3) and u:h |
| 112 | | (0.4) and that Saddam Hussein had taken=away all this |
| 113 | | with industry and and uh an'=u:h |
| 114 | | y'know- this is- this is like |
| | | ((gesturing palms forward)) |
| 115 | | human rights a*side*. |
| 116 | | (0.4) y'know he wasn't even talking about- |
| 117 | | cuz he was probably (.) uh |
| 118 | | (.) a person in power too |
| 119 | | (0.3) um but |
| 120 | | (.) u:m but=he's he was saying, u:h |
| 121 | | (1.7) that thanks to *you*, |
| 122 | | (0.9) uh, Iraq will |
| | | ((pointing)) |
| 123 | | look like this again. |
| 124 | W: | Hmm! |
| 125 | G: | (.) And I 'member that just really sticking out to me, |
| 126 | | because it was like, |
| 127 | | (1.5) obviously wer- we go in to uh |
| 128 | | (0.3) y'know (.) uh *oust* the oppressor and |
| 129 | | (.) free oppressed people and things like that and |
| 130 | | that was great |
| 131 | | (0.4) it was wonderful to see those reactions, |
| 132 | | especially in the South where there were a lot of |
| 133 | | oppressed people, |
| 134 | | but here in Baghdad where, |
| 135 | | .hh many=o'=them were- |
| 136 | | (0.4) in the same |
| 137 | | (0.3) uh: |
| 138 | | (0.4) the same uh: |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 139 | | (1.0) y'know- |
| 140 | | (0.4) uh: |
| 141 | | (.) group as, as the group of power, y'know? |
| 142 | | //not th-\|\| |
| 143 | W: | //Th'\|\| Baath party? |
| 144 | G: | .hh yeah. |
| 145 | | I mean the- many of them- like |
| 146 | | (.) most=o' them're- |
| 147 | | most=o'=the Sunnis in Baghdad *weren't* Baathists, |
| 148 | W: | Oh. |
| 149 | G: | But because they were *Sunnis*, |
| 150 | | they were still favored, |
| 151 | | they were the //y'know\|\| |
| 152 | W: | //Mmhmm\|\| |
| 153 | G: | they were the dominant (.) |
| 154 | W: | (dyeah) |
| 155 | G: | u:h group. |
| 156 | | (1.0) but even them, y'know |
| 157 | | (0.3) even (.) they wer::e |
| 158 | | (0.4) u:hm |
| 159 | | (1.8) they could see: |
| 160 | | (0.5) that Saddam Hussein was not a great leader, |
| 161 | | (that he=was) |
| 162 | | (0.3) ruining the country |
| 163 | | (more than helping it.) |
| 164 | | (0.3) Um. (1.2) y'know he='ad tried |
| 165 | | (.) in fact we saw this |
| 166 | | when=w'=went to Babylon |
| 167 | | (0.3) 'n we went to the ruins |
| 168 | | (.) of uh |
| 169 | | (.) like=th- t'the palace and things like that (.) |
| | | *G begins second story about Babylon (see "delusions of grandeur")* |

Unlike Informational narrative, which relies mainly on its events, this narrative focuses more on evaluations. Evaluations in this narrative are plenty, including (at least) comparators, gestures, and repetition. Unlike Illustrative narrative, the story depends upon the evaluations that convey positive and negative elements.[15] Included are two sets of words/phrases/abstract ideas. The "positive" set (underlined) includes words like *wonderful* (71, 76, 131), *nice* (67, 90), *lush* (70), and *great* (130). The "negative" set (zigzag-underlined) contrasts these with words like *hardly any trees* (88), *remnants* (90), *damages* (95), *war* (95), *long gone* (97), *super polluted* (98), *at the expense of* (106), *taken away* (112), *not a great leader* (160), *ruining* (171), as well as negatively-polarized characters such as *Saddam Hussein* (100) and *Hitler* (103). These charged words occur in groups – the positive group occurs first between 54 and 75, and then the negative group between 88 and 112, and finally returning to the positive group in 121-131 as G

describes the Iraqi's reaction, and his emotions related to the events: "I remember that just really sticking out to me" (125). The sentiments of this narrative involve a former beauty being lost, then later restored. The listener is invited to feel the positive aspects of the beauty, the negative aspects of its loss, and the positive hope that the character and the teller have for the future of Iraq. Compare these sentiments with the following story that builds upon the first.

*Conversational Narrative: "Delusions of Grandeur"*

In this narrative directly following the previous example, G builds upon the comparison of Hussein and Hitler (above in 100-106) by comparing two experiences he had visiting the remnants of these dictators' empires, mentioning also the remains of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon. In this narrative, his central emotional theme is a mockery of the more recent dictators, based upon the ideas that *older* and *bigger* things inspire awe (underlined), while *new* is inferior and more *fake* (zigzag-underlined).

**(Transcript 11) LING5900f09ENG7m12m3,**
**"Delusions of grandeur"**
*Context: G compares Saddam Hussein's Babylon to Hitler's Reichsparteitagsgelände, and contrasts these with Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 157 | G: | G: Even they wer::e |
| 158 | | (0.4) um |
| 159 | | (1.6)they could see:: |
| 160 | | (0.5) that Saddam Hussein was not a great |
| 161 | | leader, (that he=was) |
| 162 | | (0.3) ruining the country |
| 163 | | (more than helping it.) |
| 164 | | (0.3) Um. (1.2) y'know he='ad tried |
| 165 | | (.) in fact we saw this |
| 166 | | when=w'=went to Babylon |
| 167 | | (0.3) 'n we went to the ruins |
| 168 | | (.) of uh |
| 169 | | (.) like=th- t'the palace and things like that |
| 170 | | (.) and the hanging gardens and stuff like that |
| 171 | | (I=mean)=those are long gone=but |
| 172 | | (.) there're still ruins there |
| 173 | | (0.9) uh: an' you can see what- |
| 174 | | you can see the bricks that Nebuchadnezzar |
| 175 | | (0.6) uh: (.) had- had built |
| 176 | | (.) an'=they=all- each brick has his stamp on |
| 177 | | it, (0.3) um (.) and those are from |
| 178 | | (.) like six hundred BC, r@ight@? |
| 179 | W: | //yeah\|\| |
| 180 | G: | //s@o::@\|\| |
| 181 | | s'=yer=look'n=at=those='n=yer=like |
| 182 | | WhOW, COOL. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 183 | | (0.3) an'=then you go=t'some other parts, |
| 184 | | (0.8) and you see: |
| 185 | | (like) newer bricks on toppa=that. |
| 186 | | (1.1) and those all have |
| | | ((gesturing an inch-wide seal with fingers)) |
| 187 | | Saddam Hussein's stamp on='em. |
| 188 | | (0.9) 'cuz he was trying to rebuild Babylon. |
| 189 | | (0.5) and- |
| 190 | W: | I've *never heard* that before. |
| 191 | G: | Yeah. (.) Yeah. |
| 192 | | An' I'm looking at these and |
| 193 | | they're ALREADY crumbling. |
| 194 | | w- they were built like maybe=ten years ago? |
| 195 | | //Fif\|\|- |
| 196 | W: | //yeah?\|\| |
| 197 | G: | teen years ago? Maybe? |
| 198 | | Y'know? And I'm looking at 'em like |
| 199 | | (0.3) you've gotta=be *kidding* me. |
| 200 | | A-an'=it=reminded me (.) o:f |
| 201 | | (0.6) um (.) when I was in *Nürnberg*, |
| 202 | | (.) in Germany, |
| 203 | | (0.3) um (.)I was at (.) ah |
| 204 | | (.) the uh, Reichsparteitagsgelände |
| 205 | | which is the um (0.3) the: |
| 206 | | (.) third reich party: (.) like- |
| 207 | | (0.4) like the rally center |
| 208 | | where he held all his big rallies? |
| 209 | W: | Mmhmm. |
| 210 | G: | Um, |
| 211 | | (0.5) and it's like this big like |
| | | ((gesturing a large horizontal circular ring)) |
| 212 | | hhh soccer stadium type thing? |
| 213 | | With huge like |
| | | ((gesturing vertical columns behind ring)) |
| 214 | | ro:man columns |
| 215 | | (.) that he would stand in front of with huge |
| 216 | | ((gesturing draped banners)) |
| 217 | | (0.3) uh banners |
| 218 | | →you've //probably seen the movies← (0.3) um\|\| |
| 219 | W: | //yep. ((nodding)) yep- I have=uh=huh\|\| |
| 220 | G: | (0.5) {tsk} an'=uh |
| 221 | | (.) I mean that- the place is just- |
| 222 | | I'm sure that in its heyday it was incredibly |
| 223 | | impressive with (.) lights like (.) |
| | | ((looking up, raising palms in vertical columns)) |
| 224 | | y'know uh: |
| 225 | | (1.1) uh: |
| 226 | | (0.8) y'know |
| | | ((looking upward)) |
| 227 | | shining up y'know as- |
| 228 | | as their own like- |
| 229 | | (.) columns of light and- |
| 230 | W: | //Yeah.\|\| |
| 231 | G: | //y'know\|\|(.) huge red banners and then the |
| | | ((gesturing palms-up, high on both sides)) |
| 232 | | big like |
| 233 | | (1.0) Olympic |
| 234 | | (0.5) uh: |
| | | ((gesturing fire with palms on either side)) |
| 235 | | type uh:m torches? |
| 236 | W: | //Mmhmm.\|\| |
| 237 | G: | //Uh:\|\| basins that=f- |
| 238 | | uh=y'know huge torches, |
| 239 | | .hh and things like that I just |
| 240 | | I'm sure it was incredibly impressive. |
| 241 | | (0.4) But to see it in: |
| 242 | | (→let's see what year was I← the:re in) |
| 243 | | =nineteen ninety SEVEN, |
| 244 | | (0.9) um (0.3) the uh: |
| 245 | | (1.9) the *MARBLE* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | ((gesturing quotation marks)) |
| 246 | | (.) is already crumbling. |
| 247 | | It's- (.) it's a façade. |
| 248 | | (0.9) It's- |
| 249 | | (0.3) it was (.) um basically it was |
| | | ((gesturing spreading something on a wall)) |
| 250 | | normal (like) concrete |
| | | ((gesturing a piece of a wall)) |
| 251 | | covered with marble facing |
| 252 | | like we- w'=do in many places |
| 253 | W: | //mmhmm\|\| |
| 254 | G: | //here\|\| y'know- |
| 255 | | (.) u:m. (0.3) a::n' it was |
| | | ((gesturing a small piece removed from the wall)) |
| 256 | | coming off in chunks. |
| 257 | | (0.6) and it=was-=I'm just looking at it going |
| 258 | | (.) this guy thought he was |
| 259 | | the reincarnation of the Caesar, |
| 260 | | (0.5) y'know? An' an' thought he was a god, |
| 261 | | ba@sically@hh |
| 262 | | .hh and that he was destined t' |
| 263 | | (.) y'know t' rule an empire, |
| 264 | | and {hws-}making an empire for himself |
| 265 | | (0.5) a:nd |
| 266 | | (.) yet here it is, crumbling. |
| 267 | | Y'know (only)=a few decades later. |
| 268 | | (0.9) an'=I- an'=I saw the same thing in Babylon |
| 269 | W: | //y'know\|\| |
| 270 | G: | //S=wha- so=wh\|\| |
| 271 | W: | W'=these bricks. |
| 272 | | What=were=the=Nebuchadnezzar bricks made out of |
| 273 | | that were different that actually allowed them |
| 274 | G: | to be around for twenty-six //hundred years\|\| |
| 275 | W: | //@hehehh@\|\| |
| 276 | | as |
| 277 | | opposed to Saddam's that were crumbling after |
| 278 | | only a few decades? |
| | | *G answers W's question by explaining his views on ancient technology.* |

Throughout this narrative, G contrasts awe-inspiring, long-lasting things of old, such as *Babylon* (166, 188, 268), *Nebuchadnezzar* (174), *six hundred BC* (178), *Roman* (214), *Caesar* (259), with the new and flimsy things of the recent dictators: *newer bricks* (185), *already crumbling* (193, 246, 266-267), *10-15 years ago* (194-197), *1997* (243), *façade* (247), *normal* (250*), like we do here* (252-254), *thought he was* (258, 260), *only a few decades later* (267). He further creates this emotional association by giving his own reactions at the time: *wow, cool* (182), *you've gotta be kidding me* (199)*, I'm just looking at it going* (257-267).

G also equates the idea of size and fame with awe, even if that awesomeness turned out later to be faked. Words like *big* (208, 211, 232) and *huge* (213, 215, 231, 238) occur among *impressive* (223, 240), *heyday* (222), and *the movies* (218) to show that huge (and/or famous) things inspire awe. The evaluation in 240-241, however, shows the teller's judgment on it: *I'm sure it was incredibly impressive, but to see it in...1997.* The past tense *was,* combined with the disjunction *but* show that G is no longer impressed by the Reichsparteitagsgelände.

G's use of repetition emphasizes the most basic positive ideas of *big, huge,* and *impressive,* as well as the negative *already crumbling* (repeated three times). G also uses gestures extensively to show the size and grandeur of the Reichsparteitagsgelände (Hitler's rally area in Nürnberg, Germany). All the gestures between 211 and 246 help to draw the picture of these large, impressive rally grounds. G uses the tag question *y'know* extensively (164, 198, 224, 226, 227, 231, 238, 254, 260, 263, 267, 269), as well as other such questions (*right?*, 22), in this case to track that the recipient is effectively feeling the emotions that G is related in the narrative.

Lastly, but by no means least importantly, the teller relies on activation of shared knowledge. G says *he* in 208 after talking extensively about Hussein and Nebuchadnezzar, but W understands this to be Hitler because G has activated shared knowledge of history by mentioning *Nürnberg* (201), *Germany* (202), *Reichsparteitagsgelande* (204), and *Third Reich* (206). Taken together, these are all that W needs to know to decide who *he* is in 208. The only place Hitler is mentioned is in the previous story, lines 100-103: *[Saddam Hussein] was running the country much like Hitler was running Nazi Germany.* While this does serve to preview the upcoming

second story, it occurs several minutes prior, and G is certainly relying more on shared knowledge of the other pieces mentioned to give a referent to *he* being Hitler rather than Hussein or Nebuchadnezzar.

*Features Found in Evocative Narrative*

The shared knowledge helps to create the desired shared feeling that G is getting across, as both narratives involve portraying already-much-stigmatized Hitler and Hussein. While Nebuchadnezzar and Caesar might have been just the kind of dictators that these two were, Hitler's and Hussein's places in today's view of history is much more prominently negative. G even portrays Nebuchadnezzar as somewhat positive, in the sense that his legacy has lasted 2600 years. G is relying on an expected shared feeling about Hitler and Hussein in order to convey the other emotions he is trying to evoke. Using these together, I present in Table 6 the common features of Evocative narratives.

Table 6: Features of an ***Evocative*** Narrative

| **Features that qualify:** | **Features that disqualify:** |
|---|---|
| • Narrator expresses emotions within the narrative. These are mostly in evaluations, but also in charged words in the events (verbs like *ruin*), background (*he'd given us food before*), descriptions (*huge, lush greenery*), or even gestures (*{looking up with raised palms}* for *lights like columns*).<br>• Sense of teller's idea of "positive" and/or "negative" feelings throughout, often through repetition (*An' I'm just looking at it/them going, you've gotta be kidding me*; *Already crumbling*)<br>• Listener encouraged to feel something similar to the narrator's emotions with respect to the events.<br>• Could potentially be hypothetical, as a fable or parable. | • No sense of "good" or "bad" applies.<br>• No emotional evaluations.<br>• Listener has no obligation to feel anything about events. |
| **Features to look for:**<br>• Polarizing words that convey distinctly "positive" or "negative" qualities: (ex: *glad*, *wonderful*, *nice*, *beautiful* vs. *ruin*, *damage*, *polluted*, *at the expense of*)<br>• Repetition of qualitative internal evaluation (ex: *huge* and *ancient* = good, *crumbling* = failure)<br>• Drawing upon shared knowledge or opinions (negative views of Hussein and Hitler, knowledge of Hitler's empire, a shared awe of ancient civilizations)<br>• Charged characterizations of reported speech (not found in this data set; see studies below). | |

There is already existing research on emotionally charged narrative. Günthner (1997) shows that some narrative can effectively characterize reported speech as positive or negative in its tone and characterization (pp. 267-268). In reporting speech, actions and attitudes of authority figures, Johnstone (1987) found that speakers alternate tenses more when characterizing authority figures. Evocative narrative – whether it is a new story or a repeated one – draws on far more than just its events, characters, or even its main idea. It draws on shared experiences, attitudes, and the connection between storyteller and listener. The close relationship between life stories and Evocative narrative shown in the two stories above is consistent with Schiff and Noy (2006), who assert that life stories "allow us to explore subjective understandings in great complexity and draw interpretations about how persons make sense of self and world" (p. 398). Relying on shared meaning, as seen above and in Schiff and Noy's analysis, is how a narrative evokes emotion, effectively connecting teller to listener.

### *Possible Overlap of Features and Functions*

There is the possibility that a narrative could share features of more than one category. For example, many narratives include some aspect of Informational, unless they are hypothetical or the recipients have prior knowledge. Even Illustrative and Evocative narratives have a sequence of events which might have actually happened, and so to this extent they will inform the recipient of that sequence. There is the possibility that an Informative narrative (if it were sufficiently evaluated throughout) could be suddenly "transformed" into an Illustrative one if the teller decided to add a "moral" to drive home

the narrative's tellability, or to wrap up the topic in the conversation (e.g., after an Informative narrative about getting a speeding ticket, adding "so that's why you should never speed on Hwy 62"). A number of Illustrative narratives could be considered Evocative, if their evaluations are emotionally charged enough and a pattern of repetition can be found in them, especially if the narrative's thesis was emotionally charged to begin with. This spectrum of narrative purpose will indeed have its overlapping exceptions, but I find it useful to divide and analyze the commonalities of these purposes in narrative. This is so that the devices that are found in narrative are highlighted within the context of the purpose of the narrative in which they are found. For example, events and characters may be highlighted by their use in an Informative narrative. Evaluation and coda would be showcased in an Illustrative narrative, and repetition and shared meaning may take center stage in Evocative narrative.

## Conclusions

I have outlined three basic purposes for narrative, and found their use in a formal classroom presentation as well as in informal conversations. I have analyzed the features of these purposes, such that other researchers could analyze more data, in other genre and with other participants, with the tendencies toward these purposes in mind. I will conclude by discussing this study's limitations, the implications of such a categorization, and how it contributes to the existing research on narratives in conversation and in the classroom.

### *Limitations*

This analysis has been focused mostly on the purposes of the speaker, rather than the participations of the listener. Since nearly all of the data for this study involved the teller contributing far more than the recipient, it remains to be seen how the negotiation and interaction of the other participants will affect the overall purpose of the story. It is possible that purposes could be found to change if other participants influenced it enough.

While this analysis seems a bit incomplete without the presence of an Evocative narrative in the classroom data set, I am confident that future research in certain classrooms will be conducive to finding such data. More than likely, I would expect to find Evocative narrative in classrooms involving social sciences, humanities, and interpersonal relations, more than in classrooms of chemistry, mathematics, and physics. A classroom's Evocative narrative (and the listeners' reactions to it), should it be found and analyzed, would contribute greatly to the findings of this paper.

### *Contributions to Research*

Outlining a set of features across different genre of narrative not only gives us a better understanding of narrative, but also sets parameters that can be measured and analyzed in subsequent research (Swales, 1990). Categorizing narrative by its purpose (or "function", Takahashi, in press) allows the features of each category to come into a useful focus. Using Labov's (1972) foundation of the features of a narrative (such as evaluation), I show how they can be used to find the *"raison d'être"* (p. 366) for the narrative. By comparing narrative in the classroom to more casual conversation, this study contributes a broader view of English narrative for teachers of English (Hatch,

1992). By finding and analyzing the functions of narrative that can be seen in both lecture and conversation, this study creates a broad base of functional criteria into which narrative (in-class or not) can be analyzed in context.

### *Pedagogical Applications and Final Conclusions*

I have shown that regardless of the discourse genre (casual conversation or research presentation), narratives reveal their purposes in analyzable features. Teachers (and students) can harness these purposes. Using event sequences and orientation, the teacher can use narrative for the transfer of facts (Information) in an efficient and effective way. Using a thesis-like assessment and providing evidence, the teacher can use narrative to be persuasive in supporting an important point (Illustration). Harnessing shared emotions between storyteller and listeners, a teacher can create a living experience that involves all of his or her students (Evocation).

Research of this kind will contribute to the strategies that professors employ in the use of narrative to teach, as well as to the composition of narrative for anyone who wants to be a storyteller. By delving into existing narrative, we can see that narrative is not just an impromptu part of casual discourse, nor a planned-out part of a lesson plan, but rather an integral part of human discourse. This ultimately puts narrative in a prominent place inside and outside the classroom, serving to inform, persuade, and involve us all.

Notes

[1] I would like to thank Wade Bullick for allowing me to use the data he collected.

[2] In order to maintain a broad definition, I discuss "narrative" without distinguishing between "narration" and "storytelling". For the purposes of this paper, no disambiguation is necessary. When either term is used, they have been matched appropriately with the authors' respective uses, in order to maintain faithfulness to their arguments.

[3] Swales's later book, *Research Genres* (2004), questions the "value and viability of such definitional depictions" of genre (p. 61), promoting instead the idea of "metaphors of genre" by the purpose of their classification. In such metaphors he describes genre as: "Frames of Social Action," "Language Standards," "Biological Species," "Families and Prototypes," "Institutions," and "Speech Acts," depending upon the reason one needs to use the idea of genre. This opens up genre to more applications for more purposes, and, in his opinion, offers better opportunity for new genres to arise and evolve. For the purposes of this paper, his earlier definition will suffice; however, if I had to use one of his metaphors, I see the "lecture" genre in this case as a "Speech Act," following common rules and tendencies of university lectures.

[4] Daniel notes that this phrase "may seem tautologous, but I have used these words in combination to emphasize the necessary link between storytelling and that which I believe characterizes effective teaching: an understanding of how narrative frames our understanding of the world in which we function" (2007, p. 737). Thus, the teacher's story should be not only a narrative, but be based upon the idea that all our understanding is narrative at its core.

[5] This aspect of lecture genre is intended, by all studies cited, to refer to large lectures. Smaller classrooms in certain subjects may open themselves to varying degrees of teacher-student interaction, much more so than a lecture given to 40+ students. The lecture data collected for this paper were from a lecture given to 45 students, and as expected, there is little to no active contribution from the students.

[6] All names of participants and the names they mention have been given pseudonyms. Their actual names have also been blacked out on the presentation handout in Appendix H. Proper names of countries and world leaders found in data sets 2 and 3 have not been changed.

[7] For example, if a teller gives an abstract of a story, and the recipient responds with a "hmm!", then depending upon the intonation of that utterance (whether it is "revelatory" enough in expression), that could be enough evidence that the recipient does not have enough prior knowledge of the story as to render it untellable. Other such minimal utterances (*huh*, *really*, etc.) that are generally considered evaluations may serve the same purpose (at the same time they evaluate), by showing that the recipient either does or does not possess a level of knowledge that would disqualify him as a potential recipient.

[8] The line numbers of the transcripts in this section start over in each excerpt, since the video between the other excerpt(s) transcribed and this narrative were not transcribed. The portions that were not transcribed were deemed not to be relevant to the main narrative analyzed. The time of the video is given for all three excerpts.

[9] Please note here (and in later sections with multiple transcripts) that there are several separate transcripts from the same video recording, with untranscribed material between them. For example, in this section, there are two minutes between the end of Transcript 2 and the beginning of Transcript 3, and four minutes between 3 and 4. As stated above, the portions that were not transcribed were deemed not to be relevant to the main narrative analyzed.

[10] Another possible implicit question could be "why was the Peace Corps kicked out?" This is a fair question, and the events given support this just as much. I chose "how did Uzbekistan become the strictest country in Central Asia" because of W's clarification question at the end of the narrative, which has a

broader scope than just the Peace Corps. Since W and G are talking about Central Asia in general before this, it is more likely that G mentions the Peace Corps as a way to keep the informational narrative (general information on Central Asia) relevant to the parties at hand, by involving his wife in the narrative.

Regardless of the exact question (since it is implicit), the important thing to note with this narrative (and all informative narrative) is that the sequence of events is what answers the question and receives the most importance, rather than evaluations (in Illustrative) and orientation (in Evocative).

[11] Labov (1972) prohibits hypotheticals/fables/parables from being a narrative at all, but I merely exclude it from being "informational". There is the possibility that a narrative could be considered Informational even if it has hypothetical events, if someone asks the prospective teller about something hypothetical: e.g. "What would you do if you were to have a fire in your apartment?" The resulting narrative would obviously answer the question, while still being hypothetical. I would argue that these narratives are much more likely to fall under Illustrative, since such a question and answer would be likely to answer a "why" question, rather than a question that arises from the asker's lack of information. See p. 48 for a brief discussion of possible feature-sharing between the three categories.

[12] While it seems evident through the evaluations in this narrative that A has an opinion about clip art, it is not as evident that he successfully "supported his argument." That is, he asserts that *it makes it friendlier,* but adds very little to support this. The narrative occurs very briefly, and never really gets fleshed out: his publisher wanted to use clip art, he didn't, and then eventually things got worked out. It could be argued very easily that this is an example of a *failed* illustrative narrative, since although he began to (in Takahashi's words) "provide an example of a previous abstract idea", his narrative arguably fails to "provide support for the professor's previous view," beyond stating it and evaluating it.

[13] Labov places the main Evaluation at the apex between "complicating action" and "resolution", but explains that this Evaluation is usually (in practice) found echoes in various bundles throughout the narrative (1972, p. 369).

[14] This question may seem like a potential-recipient-produced Knowledge Gap, as seen in Informational narrative. However, Informational narrative answers its questions with events, and the question *What was it like* cannot be fully answered with only events. The evaluative uses of adjectives, gestures, repetition, and comparators, to name a few, set these Evocative narratives apart from merely being Informational.

[15]This narrative still has illustrative qualities, such as the potential thesis in 159-163: *they could see that Saddam was not a great leader, that he was ruining the country more than helping it.* The argument could be made that this would qualify as both Illustrative and Evocative (cf. p. 48 on overlap of features and functions).

# References

Daniel, A. (2007). From folktales to algorithms: developing the teacher's role as principal storyteller in the classroom. *Early Child Development and Care, 177,* 735-750.

Ganske, L. (2007). Storytelling: the forgotten technology. *International Journal of Instructional Media 34,* 335-347.

Günthner, S. (1997). The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (Eds.), *The language of emotions: Conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation*, (pp. 247-275). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Greimas, A. & Cortes, J. (1982). *Semiotics and language: An analytical dictionary.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hamer, L. (2000). Oralized history: History teachers as oral history tellers, *The Oral History Review, 27*(2), 19-39.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, J. & Marra, M. (2005). Narrative and the construction of professional identity in the workplace. In J. Thornborrow & J. Coates (Eds.) *The Sociolinguistics of Narrative*, (pp. 193-213). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Johnstone, B. (1987). 'He says...so I said': Verb tense alternation and narrative depictions of authority in American English. *Linguistics, 25,* 33-52.

Karatsu, M. (2004). *A study of storytelling in Japanese conversation*. University of Minnesota: Ph.D. Dissertation.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Noe, L. (2002). Heard the one about the principal who painted the door? *Journal of Staff Development, 23*(3), 20-22.

Norrick, N. (2000). *Conversational narrative: Storytelling in everyday talk.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Norrick, N. (2005). Interaction in the telling and retelling of interlaced stories: The co-construction of humorous narratives. In U. Quasthoff & T. Becker (Eds.), *Narrative interaction,* (pp. 263-283). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Polanyi, L. (1985). *Telling the American story: A structural and cultural analysis of conversational storytelling.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sacks, H. (1984). On doing being ordinary. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of Social Action*, (pp. 413–29). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures in conversation, Volume 2.* Ed. by Gail Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schram, P. (1994). Collections from the people of the story. In The National Stortelling Association (Ed.), *Tales as tools: The power of story in the classroom,* (pp. 176–178). Jonesborough, TN: The National Storytelling Press.

Schiff, B. & Noy, C. (2006). Making it personal: Shared meanings in narratives of Holocaust survivors. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.) *Discourse and identity,* (pp. 398-425). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: Exploration and applications.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Szatrowski, P. (in press). Creating involvement in a large lecture by telling the story of a haiku. In *Storytelling across Japanese conversational genre*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tannen, D. (1987). Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk. *Language, 63,* 574-605.

Takahashi, Y. (in press). The functions of narratives in Japanese university lecture discourse. In P. Szatrowski (Ed.) *Storytelling across Japanese conversational genre*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

# APPENDIX A: "How I got involved in research evaluating a website"

Transcript 1
L5900f09STORY10m9m1, 14:13-15:57
A = 10m, Professor presenting on research
T = 9m, Undergraduate co-presenting

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Having explained the features and purposes of the website, Professor A introduces undergraduate Student T, who then explains how he got involved in the research project and what his role was.* | | |
| 1 | A: | so what we were doing= |
| **2** | → | n' Toby is going to describe to you |
| 3 | | (.) was an effort to move in and |
| 4 | | find out what users actually *DO:* |
| 5 | | at th=website (.) n'w=tha=we *have* it |
| 6 | | (0.4) wha=do they do with it |
| 7 | | (.) and wha-hh. what benefits might |
| 8 | | (accrue=from that) (.) |
| | | ((turns and motions to Toby)) |
| 9 | | so you're on. |
| | | // ((steps back)) \|\| |
| 10 | T: | //sure |
| | | ((stands up)) \|\| |
| | | ((back facing class)) |
| 11 | | So: |
| | | ((turns)) |
| 12 | | (0.2) um: |
| 13 | | (.) I'm Toby, by the way |
| 14 | | (.) if=you=can't |
| 15 | | (if=you don't know me by now) |
| 16 | | uh but=uh I- uh: got involved |
| 17 | | with this project my freshman year |
| 18 | | after uh |
| 19 | | (0.2) being in uh |
| 20 | | (.) Professor Cavitz's |
| 21 | | uh seminar, a:nd=um: |
| 22 | | (0.3) uh=basically: |
| 23 | | (1.1) after=discussing with him for a while |
| 24 | | uhhm throughout the semester::=we:: |
| 25 | | found that this project=was=going=on |
| 26 | | and like he said he wanted somebody |
| 27 | | (0.3) u:m to come in an=and=evaluate this website |
| 28 | | (.) and so that's where I came along |
| 29 | | (.) and uh (.) also my co-researcher, Lars White? |
| 30 | | (0.3) um |
| 31 | | (0.5) we both applied for University grants |
| 32 | | (.) to uh |
| 33 | | (.) basically:: |
| | | ((gestures with paper)) |
| 34 | | (0.5) evaluate the website, see: |
| 35 | | (0.3) how effective it is for students, |
| 36 | | a::nd how=th-=how=they're using it=n |
| 37 | | (.) what their thoughts=n: recommendations=n: |
| 38 | | feelings=n: what- basically=what |
| 39 | | are they gain(ing) from it. |
| 40 | | (0.5) A:nd so, |
| 41 | | (0.8) um (.) our purpose like=I=said was to |
| 42 | | evaluate the=ffectiv'ss of the website. |
| 43 | | (.) And we got our grant in=the=uh: |
| 44 | | (0.3) we applied for it in the fall of |
| 45 | | 2007 and uh it was for spring=of 2008 |
| 46 | | and then=uh because of some |
| 47 | | (0.4) website delays (.) of |
| 48 | | (.) creating the website (.) |
| 49 | | and also we wanted to (.) test its uh: |
| 50 | | (0.3) how people thought of its graphics and stuff, |
| 51 | | um: we did some testing over the summers |
| 52 | | and prli-=preliminary (testing?) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 53<br>54<br>55<br>56<br>57<br>58 | | so we REally didn't actually get to doing<br>research on the actual um effectiveness<br>of the website until uh February<br>o:f last year=February=2009<br>er, this year u:m.<br>(0.4) so (0.7) |
| | | *((T continues describing his role in the research project))* |

# APPENDIX B: "How Uzbekistan became the strictest country in Central Asia"

**Transcript 2**
**L5900ENG7m12m1, 4:05-4:20**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | W: | now- (0.5) |
| 2 | G: | (inaudible) |
| 3 | W: | {tsk} I don't know (.) |
| 4 | | I admittedly do not kno:w |
| 5 | | much of anything |
| 6 | | about Kyrgyzstan=I- |
| 7 | | *could* locate the general vicinity=of=it |
| 8 | G: | Mmhmm? |
| 9 | W: | On a map? (0.3) um |
| 10 | | It's one=o'=those=places= |
| 11 | | That=I've=noted=as places |
| 12 | | that people don't really acknowledge even exist |
| 13 | | //because it's\|\| |
| 14 | G: | //@hmhmm!@\|\| |
| 15 | W: | just kind of there=like (0.3) |
| 16 | | like what's the lay of the land like |
| 17 | | there what kind of terrain is it |

**Transcript 3**
**L5900ENG7m12m1, 6:20-6:50**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | And so there's- |
| 2 | | there's a lot of tension over like- |
| | | ((gesturing sorting with hands |
| | | moving over one another)) |
| 3 | | who's gonna do what=c'z=i=mean-=there's- |
| 4 | | in that region, |
| 5 | | you've got=even=in=Kyrgyzstan |
| 6 | | most of that region is still Uzbek. |
| 7 | | (0.5) a:h so: |
| 8 | | (0.3) It's- it's- |
| 9 | | Kind of a (.) |
| 10 | | They=don't=really like each other? |
| 11 | | //@hunhuhhm@!\|\| |
| 12 | W: | //Mmhmm?\|\| |
| 13 | G: | And they haven't for a long time? |
| 14 | | Uh: so it's kind of a- |
| 15 | | It's a little bit tense sometimes |
| 16 | | Not- not super violent, |
| 17 | | jus- discriminatory:, |
| 18 | | And (you know, that sorta thing) |
| 19 | | Which is kinda funny |
| 20 | | (.) cuz, y'know |
| 21 | | (.) they're related peoples, |

**Transcript 4**
**L5900ENG7m12m1, 10:30-11:17**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | It's- it's interesting, cuz |
| 2 | | (1.0) u:m my *wife* speaks Uzbek. |
| 3 | | Because she: spent time in Uzbekistan |
| 4 | | With the *peace* corps. |
| 5 | W: | Nice. |
| 6 | G: | Um, and- |
| 7 | | Before Uzbekistan closed its doors |
| 8 | | And said |
| | | ((palm forward moving right)) |
| 9 | | We don't want *ANY* westerners here |
| 10 | | (.) u:h the peace corps was=(like) |
| 11 | | The *first* to go. |
| 12 | W: | mmhmn. |
| 13 | | @huh!@ hh.a:nd |
| 14 | | Cuz=you=know they're- |
| | | ((shaking head)) |
| 15 | | (.) terrible people! |
| 16 | | @hheh!@ th- the- |
| 17 | | Uh, Uzbekistan is the- is=the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18 | | Is politically (.) the worst (0.4) country |
| 19 | | In=that- in that region? |
| 20 | | As far as human rights an' |
| 21 | | They're basically, they've basically |
| 22 | | Returned to a totalitarian regime. |
| 23 | | (.6) U:m. (0.4) |
| 24 | | They never REALLY left it, u:m |
| 25 | | But- they *tried* to leave it? |
| 26 | | and then {ssst} came back to it? |
| 27 | | Y'know. |

**Transcript 5**
**L5900f09ENG7m12m1, 11:18-13:30**
**"How Uzbekistan became the strictest country in Central Asia"**
G=graduate student, W=undergraduate student

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | When the (0.6) when the Russian Federation |
| 2 | | (1.0) finally said |
| | | ((hand gestures of dismissal)) |
| 3 | | you're all on your own, |
| 4 | | in 1993, um, |
| 5 | | all these countries became |
| 6 | | (.) you=know, not just- (.) like (.) |
| | | ((gesturing quotation marks)) |
| 7 | | "autonomous republics", but=like straight up- |
| 8 | | (0.5) internationally recognized countries. |
| 9 | | (0.6) so there're still |
| | | ((gesturing quotation marks)) |
| 10 | | "autonomous republics" within (0.3) Russia |
| 11 | | (0.3) today, |
| 12 | | (0.4) um, but uh, |
| 13 | | like y'know Irkutsk=and |
| 14 | | (.) u:h=Dagestan |
| 15 | | there's=a=bunch=of others=but |
| 16 | | (.) u:m. (0.9) but |
| 17 | | (0.5) but the=a:h |
| 18 | | (0.3) these particular ones (are) uh: |
| 19 | | (.) on the outskirts with large |
| 20 | | (1.0) a large nationalist majority? |
| 21 | | (0.3) um (.) |
| 22 | | Uzbeks and Kyrgyz and Kazakhs |
| 23 | | all became their own countries, but- |
| 24 | | (0.3) the governments=didn't=change=at=all. |
| 25 | | (0.3) the peop-=the person that=was=in |
| 26 | | power under th-=under=the USSR, |
| 27 | | (.) stayed in power. |
| 28 | | (0.5) now in recent years |
| 29 | | in the last four or five years |
| 30 | | a few of them |
| 31 | | (.) have had coups, and |
| 32 | | (0.3) uh: (0.3) |
| 33 | | and the new |
| | | ((gesturing continuance)) |
| 34 | | person=has=taken over. |
| 35 | | (0.5) uh: Kyrgyzstan was one of those. |
| 36 | | (0.3) u:m (.) in 2005. |
| 37 | | while my- while=my=wife was there |
| 38 | | @xhuhuh@ a::h |
| 39 | | (.) and (0.3) u::hh |
| 40 | | (0.5) the- |
| 41 | | (.) all the other, |
| 42 | | (0.4) like, dictators were |
| 43 | | (.) scared (.) |
| 44 | | that w- it=was=gonna happen in their country |
| 45 | | and so they (.) did all kinds of |
| 46 | | (.) you=know house-cleaning |
| 47 | | (0.3) and, uh crack down on things |
| 48 | | (.) and uh blamed, |
| 49 | | (.) uhm th-=the coup that happened in Kyrgyzstan, |
| 50 | | (0.4) which was called the Tulip Revolution, |
| 51 | | u:m they, th-the the ousted leader blamed it |
| 52 | | (.) on non-government=organizations |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 53 | | like the Peace Corps things=like=that saying |
| | | ((gesturing accusation)) |
| 54 | | they've been t- they've been inciting |
| 55 | | (0.4) people to do this. |
| 56 | | (0.3) y'know and so, that blame |
| 57 | | (.) spread to the- these other |
| 58 | | countries=an=y'know=(all=the=other=di)ctators're=like |
| 59 | | well |
| | | ((gesturing defense)) |
| 60 | | I don't wanna leave these guys here |
| 61 | | (0.3) y'know |
| | | ((counting on fingers)) |
| 62 | | take all the (.) non-government organizations |
| 63 | | (they) take all the non-profit organizations |
| 64 | | (.) get 'em outta here, |
| 65 | | they could be missionaries |
| 66 | | they could be spies they could be- |
| 67 | | y'know whatever=whatever=whatever? |
| 68 | W: | yeah. |
| 69 | G: | and (0.3) so |
| 70 | | (.) Uzbekistan was=th- |
| 71 | | was=the strictest on those and- |
| 72 | | (.) a:i all (o=em) left. |
| 73 | W: | an' they- they |
| 74 | | adopted a completely isolationist policy? |
| 75 | G: | basically. you can still... |
| | | ((end of segment transcription)) *G explains how to get a visa to visit Central Asian countries* |

# APPENDIX C: "Clip art"

**Transcript 6**
**LING5900STORY10m9m1, 10:30-12:40**
A = 10m
X = others in classroom (unidentifiable)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | A: | hhh (.5) for those of you who've been on the |
| 2 | | website, |
| 3 | | you'll notice that we have VIDEO? ( |
| 4 | | 1.0) we have hours of video, |
| 5 | | but we had to be very careful. (.) |
| 6 | | we *OD* on too much video, don't we= |
| 7 | | =if=you=go=to a website |
| 8 | | and there are too many video cuts, |
| 9 | | you get *tired*. (.3) |
| 10 | | so we: wanted=to keep them SHORT? |
| 11 | | (.4) and we wanted=to keep them FRIENDLY? |
| 12 | | (.4) aa:::nd we=don't=have=any=that=goes=on for |
| 13 | | more tha:n a minute=or two. |
| 14 | | O::k. (.) and then we=have=*audio*, |
| 15 | | (.3) you notice we have a lotta pictures of |
| 16 | | people? |
| 17 | | (.) we originally had clip art. |
| 18 | | and our advisers told us *NO*. use actual people= |
| 19 | | =we got their permission= |
| 20 | | =and it makes it *friendlier* doesn't it? |
| 21 | | to have faces of rw@*real*@ human beings |
| 22 | | as opposed to: the::se nerdy type thing- |
| 23 | | =people=like? //(.4) {tss} hh@hhh@\|\| |
| 24 | X: | //{@hhuhh@}\|\| |
| 25 | A: | i have=a- I have=a::mm {tsk} I have a=uh: |
| 26 | | online website for um uh:=a web COURSE |
| 27 | | on uh=assessing uh=language (.) ability |
| 28 | | and=uh .hh eh::=it's with Hampton Publishers, |
| 29 | | and they insisted on using these nerdy clip art |
| 30 | | thing-z=sa=h=thum- some=o'=them i find *very* |
| 31 | | offensive. and //i say don't use this\|\|= |
| 32 | X: | //{hmmm!}\|\| |
| 33 | A: | =don't use this=lookit=this=it'sa cari- iz=like= |
| 34 | | =a horrible *ca:ri*cature of somebody, (.3) |
| 35 | | so they cleaned it up a bit but they insist on |
| 36 | | using this=this clip art which I- (.5) |
| 37 | | so=I=dn=know we=were=using real people, that's |
| 38 | | good. (.3) |
| 39 | | we ALSO used something called a cyber pad. have |
| 40 | | any=of=you=seen a cyber pad, (.3) |
| 41 | | it looks like a *tablet* |
| | | ((hands flat together out front)) (.3) |
| 42 | | and what we wanted to get at was BRAIN dumps. |
| 43 | | we wanted to get what was *I:N* the *HEA:D* of the |
| 44 | | *LEAR:NER*, (.) so, we had them scrawl down. |
| 45 | | so that duwit?= |
| | | ((pointing to "duwit" on handout)) |
| 46 | | =you see the duwit? that's- we used a cyber pad. |
| 47 | | (.3) that's the student actually scratching down, |
| 48 | | (.) th=the way they store that material in their |
| 49 | | mind, (.3) that's their strategy, |
| 50 | | and we=we sent it right to the computer. (1.6) |
| 51 | | that's a cyber pad. so we used VIDEO: AUDIO: CYBER |
| 52 | | pad material, we used various um |
| 53 | | d-=MEA:NS to get the material uh:: into the- onto |
| 54 | | the website. aa:nd u:hh (.) |
| 55 | | u:m (.3) the usability (.) study we did the summer |
| 56 | | of two thousand=n=EIGHT, was focused |
| 57 | | on what students thought of our graphics. |
| 58 | | and we did clean up our graphics=some because we |
| 59 | | did get some feedback. =people had (.) → had |
| 60 | | issues with=some of our graphics.← ((swallows)) |
| 61 | | {tsk} hh NAVigating our website. (.) .hh OKAY. so |
| 62 | | then finally |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 63<br>64 | | ((reading))<br>I NEED to enhance my grammar strategy<br>rept-=repertoi::re, |
| | | ((continues to read handout on website layout)) |

# APPENDIX D: "*Mexmon*-ing"

**Transcripts 7-9**
**L5900f09ENG7m12m1, 16:40-21:13;**
subclips "Setup to *Mexmon*-ing" and "*Mexmon*-ing"

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | W: | (1.2) So I'm not looking for any specifics, |
| 2 | G: | uh huh? |
| 3 | W: | Um, but like what's the pa:y like, |
| 4 | | is it like the standard of living |
| 5 | | like towards the |
| 6 | | (1.3) towards the local region, |
| 7 | | a little bit better, |
| 8 | | American, (0.4) |
| 9 | G: | We're trying to be as local as possible, |
| 10 | W: | M'kay. |
| 11 | G: | Um. (1.0) (tsk) (1.1) Um. It's not- um, |
| 12 | | just because we're teaching English doesn't mean |
| 13 | | we want to |
| 14 | | (1.1) teach them |
| 15 | | (0.9) how to be: western? //um.\|\| |
| 16 | W: | //clearly\|\| |
| 17 | | uh- well understood, yes. |
| 18 | G: | Well th-=it-=it's a big thing, |
| 19 | | around the world='n=it's something a lotta people |
| 20 | | (0.3) don't put too much stock in=they're=like |
| 21 | | "Oh, whatever, we're teaching culture." |
| 22 | | Or they don't think about it at all, |
| 23 | | they just- by deFAULT (.) y'know |
| 24 | | (.) their classroom becomes American. |
| 25 | W: | Yeah! |
| 26 | G: | Y'know. Um, |
| 27 | | (0.3) but- (tsk) but=just=in=our- |
| 28 | | in terms of our- our daily life, |
| 29 | | we really wanna be |
| 30 | | (0.3) as (0.4) |
| 31 | | we'd live in an Uzbek neighborhood |
| 32 | W: | Mmhmm. |
| 33 | G: | And, y'know, we'd really |
| 34 | | (.) relate to the Uzbeks, |
| 35 | | um, u:h on a day=t'=day basis. |
| 36 | | (0.3) y'know, they- the whole region is very um |
| 37 | | (1.4) u:h neighbor connected? |
| 38 | W: | Yeah. |
| 39 | G: | To- um=um |
| 40 | | (0.7) like (.) they do something they call mexmon-ing? |
| 41 | | which is- which basically means guesting? |
| 42 | W: | 'kay? |
| 43 | G: | Um when you go mexmon you uh you just- |
| 44 | | it just means you- |
| 45 | | you go around to your friends or whatever |
| 46 | | and you knock on their door and they'll bring you in |
| 47 | | and serve you tea and possibly dinner. |
| 48 | W: | Oh! |
| 49 | G: | I mean it's=just- //we=wou-\|\| |
| 50 | W: | //we- (maybe)\|\| |
| 51 | G: | //@huhhuhuh!@\|\| we would call it uh |
| | | ((looking up to ceiling)) |
| 52 | | what would we call it here let's see u:h |
| | | ((looks directly at W suddenly)) |
| 53 | | FREEloading? |
| 54 | W: | //YEAH!\|\| |
| 55 | G: | //@hehehehehe!@\|\| inTRUding? //@hehehehe@\|\| |
| 56 | W: | //I was about to say, like,\|\| |
| 57 | | completely uninvited, //unplanned\|\| |
| 58 | G: | //Completely\|\| uninvited, |
| 59 | | unplanned. |
| 60 | W: | Just=kinda=be=like |
| | | ((waving)) |
| 61 | | "hey what's up" |
| 62 | G: | Yeah. and it can be, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 63 | | and=y'kn-=that's=the thing, |
| 64 | | is it can be (0.4) very inconvenient, |
| 65 | | but it's incredibly taboo to refuse. |
| 66 | | (1.0) u:m. so: (tsk) there are wa:ys to refu:se, |
| 67 | | uh I haven't heard them all yet, |
| 68 | | but it's not- you wouldn't refuse, you'd bring them in |
| 69 | | and serve them tea, and then try to somehow enter into |
| 70 | | the conversation that |
| 71 | | (.) uh talks about what you're doing at the moment |
| 72 | | (.) that they might be interrupting. |
| 73 | W: | So VERY indirect! |
| 74 | G: | @VERY!@ Very indirect. |
| 75 | | Which- is- |
| 76 | | I'm very- |
| 77 | | I'm a direct person |
| 78 | | @hehe!@=hh=it's=kind=of a- |
| 79 | | even though I understand the indirectness, cuz, y'know, |
| 80 | | this=is=Minnesota, I mean we're still- |
| 81 | | we're still not |
| 82 | | (.) THAT indirect. um. |
| 83 | | and we don't have THAT kind=of- |
| 84 | | th-=Minnesota Nice doesn't come close to that kind of |
| 85 | | hospitality. |
| 86 | | @hh.uhuh!@ |
| | | ((quotation marks with fingers)) |
| 87 | | "hospitality" |
| 88 | W: | Yeah. |
| 89 | G: | I mean it IS hospitality, |
| 90 | | you're letting 'em in- |
| 91 | | you're bringing 'em in, |
| 92 | | you're serving 'em tea, and sometimes |
| 93 | | (0.7) but it's- (I dunno)=it's weird, cuz |
| 94 | | (1.0) while we were there it happened a number of times |
| 95 | | an' (0.4) um |
| 96 | | (.) it could be somebody- |
| 97 | | usually it's someone you know, sometimes |
| 98 | | (.) it's a tax collector, |
| 99 | | which is usually just as corrupt as anybody else=but as- |
| 100 | | as=long=as=you=get=a receipt then |
| 101 | | (.) you'll be ok@a:y@ uh: |
| | | ((stamping with fist)) |
| 102 | | an actual stamped receipt. |
| 103 | | so then the next time when they come around you can say |
| | | ((miming showing receipt)) |
| 104 | | na:o, I paid. |
| 105 | W: | Mhm. |
| 106 | G: | @a:heheh@ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 107 | G: | But- (0.3) but=yeah, it's=a: |
| 108 | | (.) there=were=a=number=o'=times that- |
| 109 | | people'd come by. |
| 110 | | One=of='em=was=like- the |
| 111 | | (0.3) l- one=o'=th=*last* nights we were there, and (0.6) |
| 112 | | we=were kinda debriefing |
| 113 | | (.) our time there, (with uh (.) with) our hosts and- |
| 114 | | (0.4) and they were uh: |
| 115 | | (.) y'know we=were=all jus' 'xhau:sted and ev'rything |
| 116 | | ts@hh!@omeone came @by::@ and |
| 117 | | .hhh! y'know |
| | | ((shaking head)) |
| 118 | | (0.6) an'=it's like {aughh!} |
| | | ((gestures frustration, fingers to face)) |
| 119 | | it's like ten at night 'r=something, y'kno:w |
| 120 | W: | //@hmmh!@\|\| |
| 121 | G: | //@huh@\|\| we're trying t'=have a meeting and go to *bed*, |
| 122 | | y'kno:w, |
| 123 | W: | Mmhmm |
| 124 | G: | We all=gotta get up at like five in the morning cuz=we're |
| 125 | | driving |
| 126 | | (0.3) twelve hours (y'know, across the country) |
| 127 | | (0.4) @heh!@ so it's i'=was |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 128 | | (0.4) it was interesting. |
| 129 | | But yeah. They brought ‘em in an’, |
| 130 | | served them tea and |
| 131 | | (.) *offered* them food, |
| 132 | | an’=o’=course |
| 133 | | (0.6) y’know |
| 134 | | (0.3) the- |
| 135 | | (0.4) if=yer=*in=that* |
| 136 | | if you’re in the right conversation, |
| 137 | | (0.5) you’ll offer ‘em tea, but they’ll also realize what |
| 138 | | they’re:: |
| | | ((gestures reciprocal give-and-take)) |
| 139 | | (1.5) like, butting in on? |
| 140 | W: | Mmhmm. |
| 141 | G: | B’t=they=were=there t’=ask for money. |
| 142 | | (0.3) an’=that’s- that’s- |
| 143 | | (0.6) difficult because |
| 144 | | (0.4) u:m (.) they=don’=us’ally=*do* that. |
| 145 | | (0.3) uh but they were in a spot where: someone hadta |
| 146 | | go=like |
| 147 | | their kid hadta go=ta Moscow for somethi:ng, |
| 148 | | whatever, and |
| 149 | W: | //Mmhmm.\|\| |
| 150 | G: | //just-\|\| |
| 151 | | (.) SO ah=they: |
| 152 | | (2.0) {tsk} they=ended=up |
| 153 | | (.) giving them money, |
| 154 | | (0.3) then they returned like an hour later, |
| 155 | | (1.1) wher- served=them=tea *again*, |
| 156 | | and they- they said we=found- we=found |
| 157 | | (.) money for (.) for them, we don’t |
| 158 | | (0.4) need so (they gave the money back.) |
| 159 | W: | O:kay. |
| 160 | G: | So:=it=was it=was an interesting thing |
| 161 | | cuz th’s- |
| 162 | | that’s not something that happens all the time. |
| 163 | | (0.8) but just=th- just=the fact they brought them in, sat |
| 164 | | them down and gave them tea an’ |
| 165 | | (0.4) y’know fruit an’ |
| 166 | | (0.5) bread and things like that, |
| 167 | | (0.4) y’know (.) every time that they came to the |
| 168 | | door, |
| 169 | W: | y@heah!@ |
| 170 | G: | y’know? An’ it’s like |
| 171 | | here we stand at our door and we’re like YEAH? @hiyhheh!@ |
| 172 | | whattaya want? @hehe!@ (3.0) |

# APPENDIX E: "Restoration of Iraq"

**Transcript 10**
**L5900f09ENG7m12m3, 20:06-24:24**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | G: | Once we got into Baghdad, |
| 2 | | uh we still=got=a=lot=o- of cheers, |
| 3 | | uh but one thing that we had |
| 4 | | (0.3) was just kinda a- |
| 5 | | it was a much clo:ser |
| 6 | | (0.9) uh:m |
| 7 | | (1.3) interaction with=the: |
| 8 | | with=the locals? |
| 9 | W: | Mhm |
| 10 | G: | I 'member one point um |
| 11 | | (1.1) u:hh=we saw people |
| | | ((gesturing back-and-forth)) |
| 12 | | walking by the same way every day, |
| 13 | | (y'know)=go get water, |
| 14 | | or food, or things like that, |
| 15 | | and we'd start t'=kinda, |
| 16 | | y'know, |
| | | ((waves)) |
| 17 | | wave at them, |
| 18 | | learn their names even, |
| 19 | | an'=things like that, |
| 20 | | which was cool →an' I'm really=glad=we=did=that← |
| 21 | | uh:m but=uh: |
| 22 | | some=of=the=kids would, |
| 23 | | um there=were- |
| 24 | | there=were=at least a few kids in each neighborhood |
| 25 | | that had learned some English? |
| 26 | W: | Hnyahp? |
| 27 | G: | Just- some, I mean y'know |
| 28 | W: | Hello, thank you, goodbye, |
| 29 | G: | Yeah, a few of them- |
| 30 | | a few of them had- |
| 31 | | naw, I=mean nehh'ey='d- |
| 32 | | some=o'=them='d=learned a little more than that. |
| 33 | | And every=now='n'=then |
| 34 | | you'd find someone that was from a |
| 35 | | (.) a wealthy family that had gone off to |
| 36 | | th'=University of Cairo or something and learned |
| 37 | | English very well |
| 38 | | (0.4) or studied even, |
| 39 | | in England or some'ing=like that. |
| 40 | | SO it's not unheard of=even=though |
| 41 | | (.) th' US and Iraq haven't had a whole lot of |
| 42 | | (.) //interaction,\|\| |
| 43 | W: | //yeahh.\|\| |
| 44 | G: | there've=been other |
| 45 | | (0.3) @hhuhh-hum!@ other places they've |
| 46 | | (.) they've gone to learn English um, |
| 47 | | (1.1) {tsk} so, .hhhh |
| 48 | | (0.3) u:h=hhhh I remember one point, |
| 49 | | um, an old man coming up to us, |
| 50 | | and →of course he=didn't=speak=a← *word* of English, but |
| 51 | | he='ad brought his grandson with |
| 52 | | and his grandson had been |
| | | ((motioning back-and-forth with head movement)) |
| 53 | | back and forth |
| 54 | | (0.3) he='ad brought us food befo:re, |
| 55 | | stuff like that an' uh: |
| 56 | | (0.6) (just=a=lotta-) y'know, |
| 57 | | he='ad kin'=of, uh:m |
| 58 | | (0.3) we'd kinda gotten to know 'im a little bit, |
| 59 | | (0.3) and he spoke some English, and |
| 60 | | (0.3) .hh the old man was showing us this *book.* |
| 61 | | and it was like a |
| | | ((gesturing an open book)) |
| 62 | | (1.1) 't looked like a elementary school textbook |
| 63 | | (0.4) uhm. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 64 | | (0.5) an- (.) in=it were pictures |
| 65 | | (0.7) o:f |
| 66 | | (1.0) like |
| 67 | | (0.5) really (.) nice looking river banks, |
| 68 | | (y'know)=with, |
| 69 | | (0.3) um |
| 70 | | (0.5) y'know all kinds of lush greenery an' |
| 71 | | (.) an' just wonderful- uh=y'- things |
| | | ((mimicking flipping through pages)) |
| 72 | | y'know- scenes from |
| 73 | | (.) *Iraq*=and *pic*tures, |
| 74 | | y'know not just drawings but pictures, um |
| 75 | | (0.4) of this wonderful Iraq |
| 76 | | (1.1) a:nd=it- through y'know through=uh broken |
| 77 | | English 'at his grandson was tryin' t'translate for |
| 78 | | us, um |
| 79 | | (0.9) he=w's: |
| 80 | | explaining that this was |
| 81 | | (0.5) *right* where we were standing. |
| 82 | | (1.0) um, |
| 83 | | (1.0) th=thirty years before. |
| 84 | W: | Hmm! |
| 85 | G: | Thirty to forty years before. |
| 86 | | (0.3) um |
| 87 | | (1.8) .hh hh=and I'm looking around |
| 88 | | and I'm seeing like, hardly any trees, 'n'=you=c'n=see |
| 89 | | th=the |
| 90 | | (.) y'know the=remnants of of nice like, |
| 91 | | roads and things like that but |
| 92 | | (0.3) →a lot of stuff of course is← |
| 93 | | (0.4) uhm |
| 94 | | (1.0) {tsk} *recent* |
| 95 | | (.) damages from the war, |
| 96 | | but most of it (.) is |
| 97 | | (0.3) just long gone |
| 98 | | (0.4) u:m the river is super polluted, |
| 99 | | u:m industry, industry, industry |
| 100 | | (y'know)=y- u:m y'know Saddam Hussein was running the |
| 101 | | country much like |
| 102 | | (0.5) u:h |
| 103 | | (0.3) Hitler was running Nazi Germany? |
| 104 | | (.) just very |
| 105 | | (.) very *productive*, |
| 106 | | (0.4) bu:t at the expense of everything beautiful. |
| 107 | W: | //I see!\|\| |
| 108 | G: | //@hhhh!@\|\| u:m |
| 109 | | (0.3) and that's what he was |
| 110 | | getting across to us and- |
| 111 | | (0.3) and u:h |
| 112 | | (0.4) and that Saddam Hussein had taken=away all this |
| 113 | | with industry and and uh an'=u:h |
| 114 | | y'know- this is- this is like |
| | | ((gesturing palms forward)) |
| 115 | | human rights a*side*. |
| 116 | | (0.4) y'know he wasn't even talking about- |
| 117 | | cuz he was probably (.) uh |
| 118 | | (.) a person in power too |
| 119 | | (0.3) um but |
| 120 | | (.) u:m but=he's he was saying, u:h |
| 121 | | (1.7) that thanks to *you*, |
| 122 | | (0.9) uh, Iraq will |
| | | ((pointing)) |
| 123 | | look like this again. |
| 124 | W: | Hmm! |
| 125 | G: | (.) And I 'member that just really sticking out to me, |
| 126 | | because it was like, |
| 127 | | (1.5) obviously wer- we go in to uh |
| 128 | | (0.3) y'know (.) uh *oust* the oppressor and |
| 129 | | (.) free oppressed people and things like that and |
| 130 | | that was great |
| 131 | | (0.4) it was wonderful to see those reactions, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 132 | | especially in the South where there were a lot of |
| 133 | | oppressed people, |
| 134 | | but here in Baghdad where, |
| 135 | | .hh many=o'=them were- |
| 136 | | (0.4) in the same |
| 137 | | (0.3) uh: |
| 138 | | (0.4) the same uh: |
| 139 | | (1.0) y'know- |
| 140 | | (0.4) uh: |
| 141 | | (.) group as, as the group of power, y'know? |
| 142 | | //not th-\|\| |
| 143 | W: | //Th'\|\| Baath party? |
| 144 | G: | .hh yeah. |
| 145 | | I mean the- many of them- like |
| 146 | | (.) most=o' them're- |
| 147 | | most=o'=the Sunnis in Baghdad *weren't* Baathists, |
| 148 | W: | Oh. |
| 149 | G: | But because they were *Sunnis*, |
| 150 | | they were still favored, |
| 151 | | they were the //y'know\|\| |
| 152 | W: | //Mmhmm\|\| |
| 153 | G: | they were the dominant (.) |
| 154 | W: | (dyeah) |
| 155 | G: | u:h group. |
| 156 | | (1.0) but even them, y'know |
| 157 | | (0.3) even (.) they wer::e |
| 158 | | (0.4) u:hm |
| 159 | | (1.8) they could see: |
| 160 | | (0.5) that Saddam Hussein was not a great leader, |
| 161 | | (that he=was) |
| 162 | | (0.3) ruining the country |
| 163 | | (more than helping it.) |
| 164 | | (0.3) Um. (1.2) y'know he='ad tried |
| 165 | | (.) in fact we saw this |
| 166 | | when=w'=went to Babylon |
| 167 | | (0.3) 'n we went to the ruins |
| 168 | | (.) of uh |
| 169 | | (.) like=th- t'the palace and things like that (.) |
| | | *Begins second story about Babylon (see "delusions of grandeur")* |

# APPENDIX F: "Delusions of grandeur"

**Transcript 11**
**L5900f09ENG7m12m3, 24:04-27:03**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 157 | G: | G: Even they wer::e |
| 158 | | (0.4) um |
| 159 | | (1.6)they could see:: |
| 160 | | (0.5) that Saddam Hussein was not a great |
| 161 | | leader, (that he=was) |
| 162 | | (0.3) ruining the country |
| 163 | | (more than helping it.) |
| 164 | | (0.3) Um. (1.2) y'know he='ad tried |
| 165 | | (.) in fact we saw this |
| 166 | | when=w'=went to Babylon |
| 167 | | (0.3) 'n we went to the ruins |
| 168 | | (.) of uh |
| 169 | | (.) like=th- t'the palace and things like that |
| 170 | | (.) and the hanging gardens and stuff like that |
| 171 | | (I=mean)=those are long gone=but |
| 172 | | (.) there're still *ruins* there |
| 173 | | (0.9) uh: an' you can see what- |
| 174 | | you can see the bricks that Nebuchadnezzar |
| 175 | | (0.6) uh: (.) had- had built |
| 176 | | (.) an'=they=all- each brick has his stamp on |
| 177 | | it, (0.3) um (.) and those are from |
| 178 | | (.) like six hundred BC, r@ight@? |
| 179 | W: | //yeah\|\| |
| 180 | G: | //s@o::@\|\| |
| 181 | | s'=yer=look'n=at=those='n=yer=like |
| 182 | | WhOW, COOL. |
| 183 | | (0.3) an'=then you go=t'some other parts, |
| 184 | | (0.8) and you see: |
| 185 | | (like) newer bricks on toppa=that. |
| 186 | | (1.2) and those all have |
| | | ((gesturing an inch-wide seal with fingers)) |
| 187 | | Saddam Hu*ssein's* stamp on='em. |
| 188 | | (0.9) 'cuz he was trying to rebuild Babylon. |
| 189 | | (0.5) and- |
| 190 | W: | I've *never heard* that before. |
| 191 | G: | Yeah. (.) Yeah. |
| 192 | | An' I'm looking at these and |
| 193 | | they're ALREADY crumbling. |
| 194 | | w- they were built like maybe=ten years ago? |
| 195 | | //Fif\|\|- |
| 196 | W: | //yeah?\|\| |
| 197 | G: | teen years ago? Maybe? |
| 198 | | Y'know? And I'm looking at 'em like |
| 199 | | (0.3) you've gotta=be *kidding* me. |
| 200 | | A-an'=it=reminded me (.) o:f |
| 201 | | (0.6) um (.) when I was in *Nürnberg*, |
| 202 | | (.) in Germany, |
| 203 | | (0.3) um (.)I was at (.) ah |
| 204 | | (.) the uh, Reichsparteitagsgelände |
| 205 | | which is the um (0.3) the: |
| 206 | | (.) third reich party: (.) like- |
| 207 | | (0.4) like the rally center |
| 208 | | where he held all his big rallies? |
| 209 | W: | Mmhmm. |
| 210 | G: | Um, |
| 211 | | (0.5) and it's like this big like |
| | | ((gesturing a large horizontal circular ring)) |
| 212 | | hhh soccer stadium type thing? |
| 213 | | With huge like |
| | | ((gesturing vertical columns behind ring)) |
| 214 | | ro:man columns |
| 215 | | (.) that he would stand in front of with huge |
| 216 | | ((gesturing draped banners)) |
| 217 | | (0.3) uh banners |
| 218 | | →you've //probably seen the movies← (0.3) um\|\| |
| 219 | W: | //yep. ((nodding)) yep- I have=uh=huh\|\| |
| 220 | G: | (0.5) {tsk} an'=uh |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 221 | | (.) I mean that- the place is just- |
| 222 | | I'm sure that in its heyday it was incredibly |
| 223 | | impressive with (.) lights like (.) |
| | | ((looking up, raising palms in vertical |
| | | columns)) |
| 224 | | y'know uh: |
| 225 | | (1.1) uh: |
| 226 | | (0.8) y'know |
| | | ((looking upward)) |
| 227 | | shining up y'know as- |
| 228 | | as their own like- |
| 229 | | (.) columns of light and- |
| 230 | W: | //Yeah.\|\| |
| 231 | G: | //y'know\|\|(.) huge red banners and then the |
| | | ((gesturing palms-up, high on both sides)) |
| 232 | | big like |
| 233 | | (1.0) Olympic |
| 234 | | (0.5) uh: |
| | | ((gesturing fire with palms on either side)) |
| 235 | | type uh:m torches? |
| 236 | W: | //Mmhmm.\|\| |
| 237 | G: | //Uh:\|\| basins that=f- |
| 238 | | uh=y'know huge torches, |
| 239 | | .hh and things like that I just |
| 240 | | I'm sure it was incredibly impressive. |
| 241 | | (0.4) But to see it in: |
| 242 | | (→let's see what year was I← the:re in) |
| 243 | | =nineteen ninety SEVEN, |
| 244 | | (0.9) um (0.3) the uh: |
| 245 | | (1.9) the *MARBLE* |
| | | ((gesturing quotation marks)) |
| 246 | | (.) is already crumbling. |
| 247 | | It's- (.) it's a façade. |
| 248 | | (0.9) It's- |
| 249 | | (0.3) it was (.) um basically it was |
| | | ((gesturing spreading something on a wall)) |
| 250 | | normal (like) concrete |
| | | ((gesturing a piece of a wall)) |
| 251 | | covered with marble facing |
| 252 | | like we- w'=do in many places |
| 253 | W: | //mmhmm\|\| |
| 254 | G: | //here\|\| y'know- |
| 255 | | (.) u:m. (0.3) a::n' it was |
| | | ((gesturing a small piece removed from the |
| | | wall)) |
| 256 | | coming off in chunks. |
| 257 | | (0.6) and it=was-=I'm just looking at it going |
| 258 | | (.) this guy thought he was |
| 259 | | the reincarnation of the Caesar, |
| 260 | | (0.5) y'know? An' an' thought he was a god, |
| 261 | | ba@sically@hh |
| 262 | | .hh and that he was destined t' |
| 263 | | (.) y'know t' rule an empire, |
| 264 | | and {hws-}making an empire for himself |
| 265 | | (0.5) a:nd |
| 266 | | (.) yet here it is, crumbling. |
| 267 | | Y'know (only)=a few decades later. |
| 268 | | (0.9) an'=I- an'=I saw the same thing in Babylon |
| 269 | W: | //y'know\|\| |
| 270 | G: | //S=wha- so=wh\|\| |
| 271 | W: | W'=these bricks. |
| 272 | | What=were=the=Nebuchadnezzar bricks made out of |
| 273 | | that were different that actually allowed them |
| 274 | G: | to be around for twenty-six //hundred years\|\| |
| 275 | W: | //@hehehh@\|\| |
| 276 | | as |
| 277 | | opposed to Saddam's that were crumbling after |
| 278 | | only a few decades? |
| | | *G answers W's question by explaining his views on ancient technology.* |

# APPENDIX G

## Key to transcription:

(adapted from Norrick 2000; 2005)

Intonation:

| | |
|---|---|
| . | falling/sentence-final intonation |
| ! | exclamatory high-to-low intonation |
| ? | rising intonation |
| , | continuing intonation (falling-rising) followed by a slight pause |
| → ← | flat intonation between arrows |

Breath:

| | |
|---|---|
| .hh | in-breath, number of 'h's indicate length |
| hh | out-breath, number of 'h's indicate length |

Voice quality:

| | |
|---|---|
| @ @ | laughter; utterance between @ marks is said in a laughing voice |
| ( ) | indecipherable or barely audible speech |
| CAPS | relatively high amplitude, emphasized by volume |
| *ital.* | emphasized by amplitude, pitch, and duration |
| " " | speaker changes voice to represent another character |

Length and timing:

| | |
|---|---|
| : | lengthened syllables or phonemes, number of : indicates length |
| - | cut-off; abrupt stopping of previous sound/utterance |
| (.) | micropause of less than 0.2 seconds |
| (1.5) | pause of (x) seconds |
| = | no space; fast, connected speech |

Misc:

| | |
|---|---|
| ' | missing/reduced phoneme; transcribed as legibly as possible (y'know w't't is) |
| { } | non-linguistic sounds such as laughter, clicks, etc. – sounds are still transcribed as closely as possible |
| (( )) | non-verbal behavior such as gestures and facial expressions that are potentially important to the utterance but which is more easily described than transcribed |
| // | beginning of overlap segment |
| \|\| | end of overlap segment |

Line Breaks:

Generally speaking, line breaks were inserted at syntactic completions and/or measurable pauses, in order to correspond with transition relevance places (Yule, 1996, p. 72). In instances where there was no obvious syntactic completion or pause in the space allotted (such as long strings of latched speech), lines were broken at the transcriber's judgment. No specific word length or time passage were assigned to the individual lines.